

S. P. E.

TRACTS I-X



At the Clarendon Press

CONTENTS

1. *Preliminary Announcement and List of Members.*
2. *On English Homophones.* By ROBERT BRIDGES.
3. *A Few Practical Suggestions.* By LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH.
Editorial, Co-operation of Members, &c., Report to Easter,
1920.
4. *The Pronunciation of English Words derived from the Latin.*
By JOHN SARGEAUNT, with Preface and Notes by HENRY
BRADLEY.
Correspondence and Notes.
5. *The Englishing of French Words.* By BRANDER MATTHEWS.
Dialectal Words in Blunden's Poems, &c. By ROBERT BRIDGES.
6. *On Hyphens & Shall & Will, Should & Would,* in the news-
papers of to-day. By H. W. FOWLER.
Correspondence, &c., George Saintsbury, Robert Graves,
John Sargeaunt.
7. *English Influence on the French Vocabulary.* By PAUL BARBIER.
8. *What is Pure French?* By MATTHEW BARNES.
Note on 'As to', by H. W. FOWLER.
9. *The Language of Anatomy.* By WILLIAM CUTHBERT MORTON,
edited, with an Introduction, by ROBERT BRIDGES.
Correspondence, &c.
10. *On Grammatical Inversions.* By H. W. FOWLER.
Report of Society, The American Invitation, Correspon-
dence, &c.

S. P. E.

TRACT No. I

Preliminary Announcement

¶

List of Members

Oct. 1919



At the Clarendon Press

M DCCCC XIX

Oxford University Press

London Edinburgh Glasgow New York

Toronto Melbourne Cape Town Bombay

Humphrey Milford Publisher to the University

S. P. E.

THE Society was founded in 1913, and was preparing to enter on its activities, when the declaration of war in Aug. 1914 determined the Committee to suspend proceedings until the national distraction should have abated. They met again after the Armistice in 1918 and agreed to announce their first issues for October 1919. Although present conditions are not as favourable as could be wished, it would seem that the public are disposed to attend to literary matters, and that the war has even quickened the interest and increased the number of those to whom the special objects of the Society will be most intelligible and attractive.

A false start is a misfortune, and recovery from its confusion must have an awkward appearance, for which it is needless to make further apology or explanation.

1. THE TITLE OF THE SOCIETY.

In calling itself the Society for Pure English it was not overlooked that the word Pure might carry a wrong suggestion. It should be explained that it does not denote, as it is sometimes used to denote, the idea that words of foreign origin are *impurities* in English; it rather assumes that they are not; and the Committee, whether wisely or unwisely, thought a short title of general import was preferable to a definition which would misrepresent their purpose by its necessary limitations.

2. FINANCIAL.

The founders were originally confident that they could carry on their work without asking for any subscription from the members; and although the conditions of prices

and commodities are now wholly changed and altogether unfavourable, they still hope that they may be able to keep to their scheme. If the publications of the Society are of sufficient merit, their profits should cover the expenses of an unsalaried staff; and though it shall be optional for their authors to retain a share of such prospective profits, it is hoped that most of those who contribute their work will be willing to allow all the profits to go into the funds of the Society. In the place of a small subscription, which it is as inconvenient regularly to collect as it is to pay, the secretary invites donations of any amount, great or small, which will be duly acknowledged and deposited in the Society's banking account. The sympathetic response to their prospectus warrants the belief that more donations will be forthcoming. The Society having a finite aim may, after a few years of activity, consider its usefulness to be at an end; and if, when it is wound up, it should have a balance in hand, the present Committee undertake to pay such a balance into the Pension Fund of the Society of Authors.

3. PUBLICATIONS.

The Society undertakes to publish a series of tracts on the subjects which it is founded to deal with.

It is impossible to foresee the quality or amount of such expert contributions; but the Committee intend to issue at least a quarterly paper which shall contain a report of proceedings up to date. Meanwhile the two first tracts are sent gratis to all the present members. Later issues will be announced in the literary journals, and members will be expected to buy them unless they shall pre-contract to have them supplied as they are issued, which may be done by a donation to the Society at the rate of 10s. a year. The tracts will be issued by the Oxford University Press.

4. MANAGEMENT.

The original Committee will continue to carry on until it is convenient to call a meeting of the members to relieve them of their responsibility ; and it is their plan that the members should ultimately decide the constitution of the Society. Meanwhile they guarantee the general soundness of the books and publications which will be advertised on their pages ; but under no circumstances do they make the Society responsible for all the opinions of its contributors ; they desire full discussion of all questions.

5. MEMBERSHIP.

The Committee invite the membership of all those who are genuinely interested in the objects of the Society and willing to assist in its work. They should send application for membership to the Honorary Secretary, Mr. L. Pearsall Smith, 11 St. Leonards Terrace, London, S.W. 3.

6. ORIGINAL PROSPECTUS.

The following is a reprint of the original prospectus as issued Oct. 1913 :—

LITERARY education in England would seem in one grave respect to lack efficiency, for it does not inspire writers with a due sense of responsibility towards their native speech. In most European countries men of letters, and the better class of journalists, are trained to observe the changes of the language, and to assist consciously in its development, being guided by acknowledged principles of tradition and taste. But the English language, which is now rapidly spreading over the world, is subject to no such guidance, and to very little intelligent

criticism. There is indeed occasional discussion, both in the journals and in table-talk, concerning the choice and use of special words and the standards of style; but this is mostly conducted by irresponsible persons, who have no knowledge of the history of English, and are even without any definite ideal or right conception of what the essentials of a good language must be.

It is therefore proposed that a few men of letters, supported by the scientific alliance of the best linguistic authorities, should form a group or free association, and agree upon a modest and practical scheme for informing popular taste on sound principles, for guiding educational authorities, and for introducing into practice certain slight modifications and advantageous changes.

The promoters of this association (which calls itself the 'Society for Pure English') are of course well aware of the danger of affectation, which constitutes the chief objection to any conscious reform of language. They are fully on their guard against this; and they think that the scheme of activity which they propose must prevent their being suspected of foolish interference with living developments.

The ideal of their proposed association is both conservative and democratic. It would aim at preserving all the richness of differentiation in our vocabulary, its nice grammatical usages, its traditional idioms, and the music of its inherited pronunciation: it would oppose whatever is slipshod and careless, and all blurring of hard-won distinctions, but it would no less oppose the tyranny of schoolmasters and grammarians, both in their pedantic conservatism, and in their ignorant enforcing of newfangled 'rules', based not on principle, but merely on what has come to be considered 'correct' usage. The ideal of the Society is that our language in its future development should be controlled by the forces and processes which have formed it in the past; that it should keep its English character, and that the new

elements added to it should be in harmony with the old ; for by this means our growing knowledge would be more widely spread, and the whole nation brought into closer touch with the national medium of expression.

The Society, therefore, will place itself in opposition to certain tendencies of modern taste ; which taste it hopes gradually to modify and improve. Its object will be best exhibited by stating a few definite proposals which may be regarded as typical.

I. Literary taste at the present time, with regard to foreign words recently borrowed from abroad, is on wrong lines, the notions which govern it being scientifically incorrect, tending to impair the national character of our standard speech, and to adapt it to the habits of classical scholars. On account of these alien associations our borrowed terms are now spelt and pronounced, not as English, but as foreign words, instead of being assimilated, as they were in the past, and brought into conformity with the main structure of our speech. And as we more and more rarely assimilate our borrowings, so even words that were once naturalized are being now one by one made un-English, and driven out of the language back into their foreign forms ; whence it comes that a paragraph of serious English prose may be sometimes seen as freely sprinkled with italicized French words as a passage of Cicero is often interlarded with Greek. The mere printing of such words in italics is an active force towards degeneration. The Society hopes to discredit this tendency, and it will endeavour to restore to English its old reactive energy ; when a choice is possible we should wish to give an English pronunciation and spelling to useful foreign words, and we would attempt to restore to a good many words the old English forms which they once had, but which are now supplanted by the original foreign forms.

Other foreign denizens which are claiming naturalization we would encourage on the principle of preferring

their more English forms. It would plainly be useful for writers to be acquainted with such matters ; and a list of all such words with their English history would be a good example of the sort of academic service which this Society might render.

II. The large and necessary importation of foreign words into the English language has undoubtedly weakened its ancient word-making powers ; and while all fantastic and awkward inventions and ill-sounding compounds should be avoided, it seems desirable to give at least a fair chance to words formed out of English material. Such new English words, especially new English compounds, need, it would seem, to be used for some little time before we can overcome our dislike of them, while terms of Greek and Latin origin, however cumbrous and unsuitable they may be, are accepted almost without question. We would discourage such unimaginative and artificial formations, and on principle prefer terms made of English material, which are easily understood and naturally spoken by English-speaking people.

III. Until recent years English writers were in the habit of experimenting somewhat freely in language, and to their word-coining activity we owe many of our current and most useful terms. But since Carlyle there have been until lately few experiments of this kind. Many words are added every year to the English vocabulary, but they are for the most part the deliberate creations of scientific writers ; while the very men who should concern themselves with this matter stand aloof, and leave it to those who by nature and profession are least sensitive to the aesthetic requirements. We would therefore encourage those who possess the word-making faculty to exercise it freely ; and we hope in the future that suggestions from our members may help men of science and inventors in their search for new and appropriate names.

IV. Although men of letters may occasionally add to the resources of the language by word-coining, their main activity is and must be one of selection. They are forced, for the most part, to choose their vocabulary from the supplies at hand, and by their choice they do much to give prevalence to the words which meet with their approval. Now, believing that language is or should be democratic both in character and origin, and that its best word-makers are the uneducated, and not the educated classes, we would prefer vivid popular terms to the artificial creations of scientists. We shall often do better by inquiring, for instance, not what name the inventor gave to his new machine, but what it is called by the workmen who handle it; and in adopting their homespun terms and giving them literary currency, we shall help to preserve the living and popular character of our speech.

V. The present spread of education, and the enforcement of a uniform and town-bred standard of speech throughout the schools of the country, is destroying dialects and local forms with great rapidity. These have been studied by specialists, and their value is fully recognized; but the attitude of the educated classes towards them is still contemptuous or indifferent. This ignorant contempt is to be regretted for many reasons. Not only is some knowledge of dialects needful for any true understanding of the history and character of our language, but the standard speech has in the past derived much enrichment and what is called 'regeneration' from the picturesque vocabularies of local vernaculars. The drying-up of these sources cannot but be regarded as a misfortune. We shall therefore actively encourage educated people, and, above all, teachers in country schools, to take a more sympathetic interest in the forms and usages of local speech. The Scotch Education Board has recently ordered that dialect should not be unduly discouraged in Scottish schools, and

advised that children should be allowed some use of their natural speech in class. We hope that this example may be followed all over the country. We also believe that a knowledge of provincial pronunciation, and a familiarity with the richness and beauty of the vowel sounds which it often preserves, especially in the North, would be of value to those who speak the standard language, and would certainly lead to some correction of the slurred and indistinct way of speaking which is now regarded as correct English, and deliberately taught as such on the Continent.

VI. As to idiomatic pronunciation involving speech-rhythm. The literary taste of the eighteenth century, as typified in Dr. Johnson, consciously discredited idioms which it held to be ungrammatical; and this error persists. A simple instance is the growing loss of our enclitics. The negative *not* was enclitic after the verb, and this gave us our *shan't*, *don't*, *won't*, &c. Dr. Johnson held the *not* to be too important a qualification to leave unaccented. Again, where prepositions made a pronoun enclitic, the old accent is perishing. *For it*, which used to be pronounced *forrit* as one word, is now generally spoken *faw it*, as two. The result of such conscious pedantries is not only a great damage to the rhythmic beauty of our older literature, actually teaching the folk to misread the admirable prose of our Bible, but it is a bungling interference with the natural evolution of our sentences, as we mould them to our convenience. We would trust the general ear in such questions of syllabic rhythm, and would protect as far as possible the old harmonious cadences of our traditional speech.

We have no present intention of engaging in the vexed question of the illogical and often absurd orthography of English. Members of the Society would perhaps desire some relaxation of these bonds, but we think it better to concentrate on other profounder

modifications of the language which, though of first importance, are receiving no special attention. We are aware that proposals for violent change often defeat their own end, and make all reform impossible. We shall therefore not insist on any doubtful or disputable detail as a rule of correctness; but we shall rely on suggestion, believing that we shall attain the best results by causing those who lead the fashion to consider the problems and think them out for themselves. We are convinced that by this means an ideal of self-harmonized speech will be gradually approved, and will spontaneously create a better standard of national taste, to which the future developments of the language may be safely entrusted.

These proposals will be distributed and privately circulated from hand to hand. Sympathizers, especially writers and teachers, who find themselves in agreement with the main principles of the Society, and are willing, as far as convenience and current usage allow, to promote its aims by their example, can, for the present at least, join it by invitation from one of its members.

There will be no money subscription to this Society. A list of members, with their addresses, will be printed under the Society's initials; and this will be from time to time posted to all members, who may also obtain copies of the proposals to show to friends.

With so little machinery, it may be inquired how it is expected to accomplish anything. The idea is that all members will be guided by the principles of the Society, and committed by their membership to *active* promotion of its objects, one of which will be enrolment of recruits. Many of our members will be in a position to influence public opinion directly and daily. The fact that there will be a body of united opinion seems to us all that is needed: it is only required to marshal the forces.

Should the Society find sufficient support, it would

be proposed that a small journal or occasional fly-leaves should be printed, in which questions of literary usage could be discussed in detail. The printing and distribution of useful papers by members able to help in this way could be easily arranged for by a small committee, which would be formed for dealing with this and other activities of the Society.

7. ORIGINAL COMMITTEE.

HENRY BRADLEY	SIR WALTER RALEIGH
ROBERT BRIDGES	L. PEARSALL SMITH

8. REPRINT OF LIST OF MEMBERS, 1914.

Rev. E. A. ABBOTT, D.D., &c.

LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE

W. A. AIKIN

J. G. ANDERSON, Editor, Modern Language Teaching

S. O. ANDREW, Head Master, Whitgift Grammar School,
Croydon

†Rt. Hon. Sir WILLIAM R. ANSON, Bt., D.C.L., M.P.,
Warden, All Souls College, Oxford

Rt. Hon. A. J. BALFOUR, LL.D., F.R.S., M.P., &c.

†Very Rev. H. C. BEECHING, D.D., Dean of Norwich
BERNHARD BERENSON

GORDON BOTTOMLEY

A. C. BRADLEY, LL.D., F.B.A.,

HENRY BRADLEY, F.B.A., Ph.D., Joint Editor, Oxford
English Dictionary, &c.

CLOUDESLEY BRERETON

ROBERT BRIDGES, F.R.C.P., LL.D., &c., Poet Laureate
H. H. BRINDLEY, M.A.

JAMES BRITTON, K.S.G.

GILBERT CANNAN

T. COBDEN-SANDERSON

W. A. CRAIGIE, LL.D., &c., Joint Editor, Oxford Eng-
lish Dictionary

WALTER DE LA MARE
 G. LOWES DICKINSON
 JAMES MAIN DIXON, L.H.D.
 HENRY AUSTIN DOBSON, LL.D., &c.
 HUGH E. EGERTON, Beit Professor of Colonial History, Oxford
 J. FITZMAURICE-KELLY, F.B.A., Litt.D., &c.
 †JAMES ELROY FLECKER
 W. WARDE FOWLER, D.Litt., &c.
 Rt. Hon. Sir EDWARD FRY, G.C.B., F.R.S., &c.
 ROGER FRY
 WILFRED WILSON GIBSON
 LADY GLENCONNER
 EDMUND GOSSE, C.B., LL.D., &c.
 Rev. CECIL GRANT, Head Master, St. George's School, Harpenden
 H. J. C. GRIERSON, Professor of English Literature, Aberdeen
 W. H. HADOW, D.Mus., Principal, Armstrong College, Newcastle
 THOMAS HARDY, LL.D., O.M.
 Miss JANE HARRISON, LL.D., &c.
 †HORACE HART, Hon. M.A., Controller of the University Press, Oxford
 MAURICE HEWLETT
 F. J. H. JENKINSON, Litt.D., Librarian, Cambridge University
 W. P. KER, F.B.A., Professor of English Literature, University College, London
 W. M. LINDSAY, F.B.A., LL.D., &c., Professor of Humanity, St. Andrews
 R. W. MACAN, D.Litt., &c., Master of University College, Oxford
 DESMOND MACCARTHY
 J. W. MACKAIL, LL.D., &c.
 FREDERICK MANNING
 E. MARSH, C.M.G.
 ALAN MOORE, M.B.
 NORMAN MOORE, F.R.C.P.

†F. W. MOORMAN, Ph.D., Professor of English Language and Literature, Leeds

WALTER MORRISON

GILBERT MURRAY, D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., Regius Professor of Greek, Oxford

†Sir JAMES A. H. MURRAY, D.C.L., &c., Editor, Oxford English Dictionary

HENRY NEWBOLT

Rev. A. SMYTHE PALMER, D.D.

Rt. Hon. Sir FREDERICK POLLOCK, Bt., D.C.L., &c.

Miss ETHEL PORTAL

Sir ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH, Litt.D., &c., Professor of English Literature, Cambridge

Sir WALTER RALEIGH, Professor of English Literature, Oxford

Rev. G. H. RENDALL, Litt.D.

BRUCE L. RICHMOND

FRANK ROSCOE

Sir RONALD ROSS, K.C.B., F.R.S.

W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., &c., Head Master, Perse Grammar School, Cambridge

GEORGE SAINTSBURY, LL.D., &c., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature, Edinburgh University

E. B. SARGANT

JOHN SARGEAUNT

†Miss EDITH SICHEL

J. A. SMITH, Waynflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, Oxford

G. C. MOORE SMITH, Litt.D., Professor of English Language and Literature, Sheffield

L. PEARSALL SMITH

J. A. SPENDER, Editor, Westminster Gazette

CHRISTOPHER STONE

LADY STRACHEY

†R. J. E. TIDDY, University Lecturer in English, Oxford

R. C. TREVELYAN

Rev. A. W. UPCOTT, D.D., Head Master, Christ's Hospital

HUGH WALPOLE

Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD

T. HERBERT WARREN, D.C.L., LL.D., &c., President
of Magdalen College, Professor of Poetry, Oxford

Mrs. WHARTON

H. C. K. WYLD, B.Litt., Professor of English Language
and Philology, Liverpool University

ISRAEL ZANGWILL

9. ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.

Hon. MAURICE BARING

ARNOLD BENNETT

Prince ANTOINE BIBESCO

R. W. CHAPMAN

HAROLD COX

A. CLUTTON-BROCK

W. M. DIXON, Professor of English Literature, Glasgow

OLIVER ELTON, Professor of English Literature, Liver-
pool

E. M. FOSTER

F. G. FOWLER

H. W. FOWLER

G. S. GORDON, Professor of English Literature, Leeds

Miss MAUD HAVILAND, Newnham College

C. H. HERFORD, Litt.D., Professor of English Litera-
ture, Manchester

PERCY LUBBOCK

GEOFFREY MADAN

P. E. MATHESON

H. S. MILFORD

J. C. SQUIRE

Rev. H. F. STEWART, B.D.

Miss C. L. THOMSON

Mrs. M. L. WOODS

J. WRIGHT, D.C.L., F.B.A., Professor of Comparative
Philology, Oxford

Mrs. JOSEPH WRIGHT

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

S. P. E.

TRACT No. II

On

ENGLISH HOMOPHONES

By

Robert Bridges



At the Clarendon Press
M DCCCC XIX

Oxford University Press

London Edinburgh Glasgow New York

Toronto Melbourne Cape Town Bombay

Humphrey Milford Publisher to the University

Second Impression, 1922

ENGLISH HOMOPHONES

WHEN two or more words different in origin and signification are pronounced alike, whether they are alike or not in their spelling, they are said to be homophonous, or homophones of each other. Such words if spoken without context are of ambiguous signification. Homophone is strictly a relative term, but it is convenient to use it absolutely, and to call any word of this kind a homophone.¹

Definition of homophone.

Homophony is between words as *significant* sounds, but it is needful to state that homophonous words must be *different* words, else we should include a whole class of words which are not true homophones. Such words as *draft*, *train*, *board*, have each of them separate meanings as various and distinct as some true homophones; for instance, a draught of air, the miraculous draught of fishes, the draught of a ship, the draft of a picture, or a draught of medicine, or the present draft of this essay, though it may ultimately appear medicinal, are, some of them, quite as distinct objects or notions as, for instance, *vane* and *vein* are: but the ambiguity of *draft*, however spelt, is due to its being the name of anything that is *drawn*; and since there are many ways of drawing things, and different things are drawn in different ways, the *same word* has come to carry very discrepant significations.

Though such words as these² are often inconveniently and even distressingly ambiguous, they are not homophones,

¹ Homophone is a Greek word meaning 'same-sounding', and before using the relative word in this double way I have preferred to make what may seem a needless explanation. It is convenient, for instance, to say that *son* and *heir* are both homophones, meaning that each belongs to that particular class of words which without context are of ambiguous signification: and it is convenient also to say that *son* and *sun* and *heir* and *air* are homophones without explaining that it is meant that they are mutually homophonous, which is evident. A physician congratulating a friend on the birth of his first-born might say, 'Now that you have a son and heir, see that he gets enough sun and air'.

² Such words have no technical class-name; they are merely extreme examples of the ambiguity common to most words, which grows up naturally from divergence of meaning. True homophones are separate words which have, or have acquired, an illogical fortuitous identity.

and are therefore excluded from my list: they exhibit different meanings of one word, not the same sound of different words: they are of necessity present, I suppose, in all languages, and corresponding words in independent languages will often develop exactly corresponding varieties of meaning. But since the ultimate origin and derivation of a word is sometimes uncertain, the scientific distinction cannot be strictly enforced.

False
homophones.

Now, wherever the same derivation of any two same-sounding words is at all doubtful, such words are practically homophones:—and again in cases where the derivation is certainly the same, yet, if the ultimate meanings have so diverged that we cannot easily resolve them into one idea, as we always can *draft*, these also may be practically reckoned as homophones.

Continent, adjective and substantive, is an example of absolute divergence of meaning, inherited from the Latin; but as they are different parts of speech, I allow their plea of identical derivation and exclude them from my list. On the other hand, the substantive *beam* is an example of such a false homophone as I include. *Beam* may signify a balk of timber, or a ray of light. Milton's address to light begins

O first created beam

and Chaucer has

As thikke as motes in the sonne-beam,
and this is the commonest use of the word in poetry, and probably in literature: Shelley has

Then the bright child the plumèd seraph came
And fixed its blue and beaming eyes on mine.

But in Tyndal's gospel we read

Why seest thou a mote in thy brother's eye and perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

The word *beam* is especially awkward here,¹ because the beam that is proper to the eye is not the kind of beam which is intended. The absurdity is not excused by our familiarity, which Shakespeare submitted to, though he omits the incriminating eye:

You found his mote; the king your mote did see,
But I a beam do find in each of thhee.

¹ It is probable that in Tyndal's time the awkwardness was not so glaring: for 'beam' as a ray of light seems to have developed its connexion with the eye since his date, in spite of his proverbial use of it in the other sense.

And yet just before he had written

So sweet a kiss the golden sun gives not
 To those fresh morning drops upon the rose,
 As thy eye-beams when their fresh rays have smote
 The night of dew that on my cheeks down flows.

Let alone the complication that *mote* is also a homophone, and that outside Gulliver's travels one might as little expect to find a house-beam as a castle-moat in a man's eye, the confusion of *beam* is indefensible, and the example will serve three purposes: first to show how different significations of the same word may make practical homophones, secondly the radical mischief of all homophones, and thirdly our insensibility towards an absurdity which is familiar: but the absurdity is no less where we are accustomed to it than where it is unfamiliar and shocks us.

And we are so accustomed to homophones in English that they do not much offend us; we do not imagine their non-existence, and most people are probably unaware of their inconvenience. It might seem that to be perpetually burdened by an inconvenience must be the surest way of realizing it, but through habituation our practice is no doubt full of unconscious devices for avoiding these ambiguities: moreover, inconveniences to which we are born are very lightly taken: many persons have grown up to manhood blind of one eye without being aware of their disability; and others who have no sense of smell or who cannot hear high sounds do not miss the sense that they lack; and so I think it may be with us and our homophones.

But since if all words were alike in sound there would be no spoken language, the differentiation of the sound of words is of the essence of speech, and it follows that the more homophones there are in any language, the more faulty is that language as a scientific and convenient vehicle of speech. This will be illustrated in due course: the actual condition of English with respect to homophones must be understood and appreciated before the nature of their growth and the possible means of their mitigation will seem practical questions.

The first essential, then, is to know the extent and nature of the mischief; and this can only be accomplished by setting out the homophones in a table before the eye. The list below is taken from a 'pronouncing dictionary' which professes not to deal with obsolete words, and it gives over

Tolerance
due to
habit.

Great
number.

800 ambiguous sounds; so that, since these must be at least doublets, and many of them are triplets or quadruplets, we must have something between 1,600 and 2,000 words of ambiguous meaning in our ordinary vocabulary.

Now it is variously estimated that 3,000 to 5,000 words is about the limit of an average educated man's talking vocabulary, and since the 1,600 are, the most of them, words which such a speaker will use (the reader can judge for himself) it follows that he has a foolishly imperfect and clumsy instrument.

As to what proportion 1,700 (say) may be to the full vocabulary of the language—it is difficult to estimate this because the dictionaries vary so much. The word *homophone* is not recognized by Johnson or by Richardson: Johnson under *homo-* has six derivatives of Herbert Spencer's favourite word *homogeneous*, but beside these only four other words with this Greek affix. Richardson's dictionary has an even smaller number of such entries. Jones has 11 entries of *homo-*, and these of only five words, but the Oxford dictionary, besides 50 words noted and quoted beginning with *homo-*, has 64 others with special articles.

Dr. Richard Morris estimated the number of words in an English dictionary as 100,000: Jones has 38,000 words, exclusive of proper names, and I am told that the Oxford dictionary will have over 300,000. Its 114 *homo-* words will show how this huge number is partly supplied.

Before the reader plunges into the list, I should wish to fortify his spirit against premature despair by telling him that in my tedious searching of the dictionary for these words I was myself cheered to find how many words there were which are *not* homophones.

¹ In Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary* there is a list of *homonyms*, that is words which are ambiguous to the eye by similar spellings, as homophones are to the ear by similar sounds: and that list, which includes obsolete words, has 1,600 items. 1,600 is the number of homophones which our list would show if they were all only doublets.

LIST OF HOMOPHONES

THIS list, the object of which is to make the reader easily acquainted with the actual defect of the language in this particular, does not pretend to be complete or scientific, and in the identification of doubtful words the clue was dictated by brevity. *s.*, *v.*, and *adj.* mean *substantive*, *verb*, and *adjective*. The sections were made to aid the conspectus.

The main indictment is contained in sections i, ii, and iii. These three sections contain 505 entries, involving some 1,075 words.

The homophones in the other sections, iv. v, vi, vii, viii and ix, are *generally* of such a kind that they would not of themselves constitute a very peculiar case against the English language; but their addition to the main list does very much strengthen the case. One intention in isolating them from the main list was to prevent their contaminating it with their weaker quality; but their separate classification crosses and sometimes overrides that more general distinction. Section iv has some literary interest; vi is inconsistent; the other sections are more or less scientific. These six sections contain some 330 entries involving about 700 words, so that the total of words involved is about 1,775.

The order in this section is that of the phonetic alphabet.

I. THE MAIN LIST OF HOMOPHONES.

aic, ark.	barren, baron.
arm (<i>limb</i>), arm (<i>weapon</i>).	barrow (<i>hill</i>), barrow (<i>wheel-b.</i>).
alms, arms.	bat (<i>club</i>), bat (<i>vespertilio</i>).
aunt, ant, arn't.	batter (<i>s.</i>), batter (<i>v.</i>)
arch (<i>s.</i>), arch (<i>adj.</i>).	buck (<i>various roots and senses</i>)
eye, ay, I.	bustle (<i>hurry</i>), bustle (<i>dress</i>).
idol, idle, idyll.	but, butt (<i>tub</i>), butt (<i>v.</i>)
aisle, isle, I'll.	bale (<i>ill</i>), bale (<i>pack</i>), bail <i>bis</i> .
eyelet, islet.	base, bass.
our, hour.	bate, bait.
bark (<i>dog</i>), bark (<i>tree</i>), bark (<i>boat</i>).	beck (<i>and nod</i>), beck (<i>a brook</i>).
balm, barm.	bell, belle.
bite, bight.	bury, berry.
buy, by, bye.	bear (<i>s.</i>), bare (<i>adj.</i>), bear, bare (<i>v.</i>)
bough, bow, bow (<i>of ship</i>).	berth, birth.
bound (<i>leap</i>), bound (<i>limit</i>), bound (<i>fr. bind</i>).	bee, be.
bank (<i>ground</i>), bank (<i>money</i>).	beat, beet.

beetle (*insect*), beetle (*hammer*). drill (*sow*), drill (*bore*), drill (*training*).
 beach, beech. drupe, droop.
 bier, beer. jar (*vase*), jar (*discord*).
 blow (*a stroke*), blow (*of wind*). jamb, jam.
 bow, beau. jet (*mineral*), jet (*squirt*).
 bogie, bogie. gin (*drink*), gin (*snare*), jinn.
 bole, bowl. there, their.
 bolt (*a weapon*), bolt (*sift*), bolt (*run*). the, thee.
 bore (*perforate*), bore (*tidal*), bore (*fr. bear*), boar. eh! aye (*ever*).
 board, bawd, bored. ale, ail.
 ball, bawl. eight, ait or eyot, ate (*fr. eat*).
 born, borne. egg, egg (*to incite*).
 boy, buoy. elder (*tree*), elder (*senior*).
 boil (*s.*), boil (*v.*). air, heir, ere, e'er.
 box (*tree*), box (*receptacle*), box (*v.*). airship, heirship.
 bridal, bridle. airy, airy.
 bray (*of donkey*), bray (*to pound*), brae. earn, urn, erne (*eagle*).
 break, brake (*fern*), brake (*of carriages, bis.*). alight (*adj.*), alight (*v.*).
 braze (*to solder*), braze (*to brazen*), braise (*to stew*), braes. ascent, assent.
 breach, breech. foul, fowl.
 breeze (*the wind*), breeze (*a fly*), breeze (*cinders*). fallow (*untilled*), fallow (*colour*).
 broach, brooch. fane, feign, fain.
 hue, hew. faint, feint.
 die (*v.*), dye, die (*cast*). fast (*ecl.*), fast (*adj. various*).
 down (*dune*), down (*fluff*), down (*adv.*). fate, fête
 doubt, dout. fell (*fierce*), fell (*skin*), fell (*hill*),
 dam (*mother*), dam (*obstruct*), damn. fell (*fr. fall*).
 duck (*bird*), duck (*dear*), duck (*stuff*), duck (*v.*). fellow, felloe.
 dun (*colour*), dun (*importune*), done. ferule, ferrule.
 date (*fruit*), date (*datum*). fair, fare [*doublet*], phare.
 dean, dene. fir, fur.
 deer, dear. feet,feat (*s.*),feat (*adj. obs.*).
 desert, dessert. filter, philtre.
 due, dew. fit (*befit*), fit (*conflict*), fytte [*obs.*].
 doe, dough. flag (*v.*), flag (*ensign*), flag (*plant*),
 dock (*plant*), dock (*basin*), dock (*shear*). flag (-stone).
 flee, flea. flock (*herd*), flock (*of wool*).
 flow, floe. flue (*chimney*), flue (*velu*), flew
 fluke (*fish*), fluke (*of anchor*), (fr. *fly*).
 fluke (*slang word*). fold (*wrap*), fold (*of sheep*),
 foaled. foaled.
 four, fore, for.

forego, forgo, and other compounds.	hue, hew.
fourth, forth.	humorous, humerus.
foil (<i>s.</i>), foil (<i>v.</i>), foil (<i>fencer's</i>).	even (<i>s.</i>), even (<i>adj.</i>).
fray (<i>ravel</i>), fray (<i>combat</i>).	ear, ear (<i>plough</i>), ear (<i>of corn</i>).
fret (<i>eat away</i>), fret (<i>adorn</i>), fret (<i>on lute</i>).	yoke, yolk.
freeze, frieze (<i>archt</i>), frieze (<i>cloth</i>), frees (<i>fr. free</i>).	yew, ewe, you.
gamble, gambol.	ure, ewer, your.
gum (<i>resin</i>), gum (<i>teeth</i>).	card (<i>s.</i>), card (<i>v.</i>).
gage, gauge.	cask, casque.
gate, gait.	cast, caste.
gird (<i>encircle</i>), gird (<i>revile</i>).	cart, carte, quart (<i>cards and fencing</i>).
guild, gild.	count (<i>s.</i>), count (<i>v.</i>).
guilt, gilt.	counter (<i>opp.</i>), counter (<i>of shop</i>), counter (<i>in games</i>), &c.
glare, glair (<i>white of egg</i>), + glary, glairy.	couch (<i>coucher</i>), couch (<i>grass</i>).
gore (<i>pierce</i>), gore (<i>triangle</i>), gore (<i>blood</i>).	caddy (<i>lad</i>), caddy (<i>box</i>).
groin, groyne (<i>breakwater</i>).	can (<i>s.</i>), can (<i>v.</i>).
great, grate (<i>s.</i>), grate (<i>v.</i>).	cannon, canon <i>bis</i> .
heart, hart.	currant, current.
high, hie.	curry (<i>food</i>), curry (<i>comb</i>).
hide (<i>v.</i>), hide (<i>skin</i>), hied.	colonel, kernel.
hack (<i>hew</i>), hack (<i>hackney</i>).	cape (<i>dress</i>), cape (<i>headland</i>).
hamper (<i>impede</i>), hamper (<i>han- per</i>).	caper (<i>skip</i>), caper (<i>plant</i>).
hail! hail (<i>snow</i>), hale (<i>adj.</i>), hale (<i>haul</i>).	case (<i>event</i>), case (<i>receptacle</i>).
helm (<i>of ship</i>), helm (<i>helmet</i>).	cashier (<i>s.</i>), cashier (<i>v.</i>).
hair, hare.	key, quay.
heel, heal, he'll.	keen (<i>adj.</i>), keen (<i>v.</i>).
here, hear.	cue, queue.
hymn, him.	climb, clime.
hole, whole, + holy, wholly, holey.	cleek, clique.
home, holm.	coal, cole.
hoar, whore, haw.	cope (<i>v.</i>), cope (<i>s.</i>).
hoard, horde.	coat, cote.
hawk (<i>bird</i>), hawk (<i>v. of hawker</i>), hawk (<i>hoquet</i>).	core, corps, caw.
hall, haul.	cork, caulk.
halt (<i>v.</i>), halt (<i>adj.</i>).	call, caul.
horse, hoarse	corn (<i>grain</i>), corn (<i>horny growth</i>).
hock (<i>of horse</i>), hock (<i>wine</i>).	course, coarse, corse.
hop (<i>jump</i>), hop (<i>plant</i>).	cobble (<i>to patch</i>), cobble (<i>boat</i>), cobble (-stones).

coombe (*valley*), coom (*dry measure*).
 choir, quire (*of paper*).
 quiver (*v.*), quiver (*s.*).
 queen, quean [*obs.*].
 last (*adj.*, *verb*), last (*s.*).
 lye (*s.*), lie (*v.*), lie (*s. and v.*).
 lyre, liar.
 lichen, liken.
 light (*s.*), light (*not heavy*), and hence
 lighten, lighten.
 lack, lac, lakh.
 lap (*luck up*), lap (*fold*), lap (*knees*).
 lay (*s. bis.*), lay (*v.*).
 lake (*pond*), lake (*colour*).
 let (*allow*), let (*lease, v.*), let (*hinder, obs.*).
 lee, lea.
 leaf, lief.
 league (*s.*), league (*v. and s.*).
 leak, leek.
 lean (*v.*), lean (*adj.*).
 leech (*sucker and doctor*), leech (*of sail*).
 leave (*quit*), leave (*permit*).
 limp (*adj.*), limp (*v.*).
 link (*chain*), link (*torch*), also golf-links.
 list (*listen*), list (*heel over*), list (*of flannel*).
 liver (*organ*), liver (*who lives*).
 lo! low (*adj.*), low (*of cow's voice*).
 load, lode, lowed.
 lone, loan.
 lock (*of door*), lock (*of hair*), loch.
 long (*adj.*), long (*v.*).
 lorn, lawn.
 lute, loot.
 mast (*of ship*), mast (*beech-m.*).
 march (*step*), march (*boundary*), March (*month*).
 mine (*s.*), mine (*poss. pron.*),

mite, might (*s.*), might (*v.*), [*and adj. -y*].
 mitre (*headdress*), mitre (*carpentry, &c.*).
 mass (*quantity*), mass (*office*).
 match (*equal*), match (*mèche*).
 muff (*dress*), muff (*a stupid*).
 may (*month*), may (*maid, obs.*), may (*v.*).
 male, mail (*coat of*), mail (*post*).
 mane, main.
 mace (*staff*), mace (*spice*).
 maze, maize, Mays (*pl. of month*).
 mare, mayor.
 meed, mead (*meadow*), mead (*drink*).
 mean (*intend*), mean (*intermediate*), mean (*poor*).
 mien (*countenance*).
 meet, meat, mete (*adj. and v.*).
 mere (*pool*), mere (*adj.*).
 mint (*herb*), mint (*coining*).
 miss (*fail*), Miss.
 mew (*cage*), mew (*bird*), mew (*of cat*).
 mute (*adj.*), mute (*of birds*).
 muse (*think*), Muse, mews (*stable*), mews (*fr. mew*).
 mote, moat.
 mow (*various senses*), mot (*French*).
 mole (*animal*), mole (*of skin*), mole (*breakwater*).
 mould (*to model*), mould (*earth*), mould (*rust*).
 maul (*disfigure*), Mall (*place*), mahl (-*stick*).
 morn, mourn, and morning.
 moor (*country*), Moor (*race*).
 night, knight.
 none, nun.
 need, knead, knee'd.
 neat (*s.*), neat (*adj.*).
 no, know.
 not, knot.
 oar, ore, or, o'er, awe.
 augur, auger.

all, awl, orle (*heraldry*).
 altar, alter.
 oral, aural.
 ought (*zero*), ought (*pp. of owe*),
 ort [*obs.*].
 par, pas (*faus*).
 pie (*pica*), pie (*dish*).
 pale (*pole*), pale (*pallid*), pail.
 pile (*heap*), pile (*stake*), pile
 (*hair*).
 pine (*v.*), pine (*tree*).
 pounce (*weight*), pound (*enclosure*),
 pound (*to bruise*).
 pounce (*v.*), pounce (= *pumice*).
 pallet, palette, palate.
 paten, patten, pattern.
 pulse (*beat*), pulse (*pease*).
 punch (*strike*), punch (*drink*).
 Punch (*and Judy*).
 page (*of bk*), page (*boy*).
 pane, pain.
 peck (*measure*), peck (*v.*).
 pelt (*to throw*) pelt (*skin*).
 pen (*writing*), pen (*inclose*).
 pair, pear, pare.
 pearl, purl (*flow*), purl (*knitting*).
 pique, peak.
 peal, peel.
 peep (*to look*), peep (*chirp*).
 piece, peace.
 peach (*fruit*), peach (*impeach*).
 peer (*to look*), peer (*s.*), pier.
 pill (*ball*), pill (*to pillage*).
 pink (*a flower*), pink (*a colour*),
 pink (*to pierce*).
 pip (*a seed*), pip (*a disease*), pip
 (*on cards*).
 pitch (*s.*), pitch (*to fall, &c.*).
 plight (*pledge*), plight or plite
 (*to plait*), and 'sad plight'.
 plat (*of ground*), plait.
 plum, plumb.
 plump (*adj.*), plump (*to fall
 heavily*).
 plane (*tree*), plain [*both various*].
 plot (*of ground*), plot (*stratagem*),
 + verbs.

pole, poll.
 poach, (*eggs*), poach (*steal game*).
 pore (*of skin*), pore (*top over*), paw.
 potter (*v.*), potter (*s.*).
 pall (*v.*), pall (*cloak*), pawl (*me-
 chanics*).
 pry (*inquisitive*), pry (*to prise
 open*).
 prise, prize.
 pray, prey.
 prune (*fruit*), prune (*v.*).
 rye, wry.
 rhyme, rhyme.
 right, write, wright, rite.
 rabbit, rabbet (*carpentry*).
 rack [*various*], wrack.
 racket, racquet.
 rally (*assemble*), rally (= *raillery*).
 rank (*s.*), rank (*rancid*).
 rap, wrap.
 rash (*s.*), rash (*adj.*).
 ruff, rough.
 rum (*queer*), rum (*drink*), rhumb
 (*naut.*).
 rung (*s.*), and past pp. rung,
 wrung.
 rush (*s.*), rush (*v.*).
 rape (*seed*), rape (*razish*), rape
 (*divn. of couny. obs.*).
 race (*family*), race (*root*), race
 (*that is run*).
 rate (*proportion*), rate (*to chide*).
 rut (*furrow*), rut (*of animals*).
 rake (*tool*), rake (*a prodigal*).
 rake (*of a ship*).
 rail (*fence*), rail (*chide*), rail (*bird*).
 rain, reign, rein.
 raise, raze.
 reck, reck.
 rent (*paymt.*), rent (*s., tear*), rent
 (*fr. rend*).
 rest (*repose*), rest (*remainder*).
 wrest.
 reed, read.
 reef (*of rocks*), reef (*of sails*).
 reek, wreak.
 reel (*highland-*), reel (*cotton-*).

reach, retch.
 reave, reeve (*naui.*), reeve (*baillif*, *obs.*).
 rifle (*ransack*), rifle (*s. v., groove*).
 rear (*raise*), rear (*arrière*).
 rig (*of ship*), rig (*prank, riggish*),
 rig (*-s of barley*).
 rick (*of corn*), rick wrick (*strain*).
 ring, wring.
 repair (*mend*), repair (*resort, v.*).
 row (*oaring*), row (*s. of things in
 line*), roe (*of fish*), roe (*fem.
 dee'*).
 roll [*various*], rôle.
 rock (*stone*), rock (*v.*), roc.
 rocket (*plant*), rocket (*firework*).
 rue (*plan!*), rue (*v. of ruth*).
 rude (*adj.*), rood (*s.*), rued (*fr.
 rue*).
 room, rheum.
 root, route.
 rout, route (*military*).
 sign, sine (*trigonom.*).
 site, sight, cite.
 size (*magnitude*), size (*glue*).
 sough, sow.
 sound (*noise*), sound (*to fathom*),
 sound (*adj.*), sound (*strait of
 sea*), sound (*fish bladder*).
 sack (*bag*), sack (*to plunder*), sack
 (*wine*).
 sallow (*a willow*), sallow (*pale
 colour*).
 sap (*of trees*), sap (*mine*).
 sum, some.
 sun, son + sunny, sonnie.
 sage (*plant*), sage (*adj.*).
 sale, sail.
 sell, cell.
 sense, cense.
 censual, sensual.
 surge, serge.
 surf, serf.
 scent, cent, sent (*fr. send*).
 session, cession.
 sea, see.
 seed, cede.
 seal (*animal*), ciel or ceil. seal
 (*sign*).
 seam, seem.
 sear, sere, cere, seer.
 serial, cereal.
 signet, cygnet.
 cist (*box*), cyst (*tumour, Gr.*).
 scar (*of wound*), scar (*a rock*).
 skull, scull.
 scale (*shell*), scale (*of balance*).
 scale (*of stairs*).
 scald (*burn*), skald (*poet, Norse*).
 scrub (*of shrubs*), scrub (*v.*).
 sledge (*vehicle*), sledge (*-hammer*).
 slight, sleight.
 slay, sleigh (*sledge*).
 slate (*s.*), slate (*v., abuse*).
 sloe, slow.
 slop (*puddle*), slop (*loose gar-
 ment*).
 slot (*track*), slot (*bar*).
 sole (*adj.*), soul, sole (*a fish*).
 sow, sew.
 saw (*tool*), soar, sore, saw
 (*maxim*), saw (*fr. see*).
 soil (*ground*), soil (*defile*), soil
 (*v., of horses*).
 spar (*beam*), spar (*mineral*). spar
 (*to box*).
 salter (*who salts*), psalter.
 source, sauce.
 spell (*incantation*), spell (*letters*),
 spell (*turn of work*).
 spill (*upset*), spill (*match*).
 spit (*v.*), spit (*roasting*), spit (*of
 land*).
 spray (*drizzle*), spray (= *sprig*).
 spruce (*tree*), spruce (*adj.*).
 style, stile.
 stud (*nail*), stud (*of horses*).
 stake (*post*), steak, stake (*deposit*).
 step, steppe.
 stair, stare.
 stern (*adj.*), stern (*of ship*).
 steal, steel, stèle.
 steep (*adj.*), steep (*v.*).
 steer (*direct*), steer (*young ox*).

still (*tranquil*), still (*distil*).
 stalk (*stem*), stalk (*v.*), stork.
 story, storey.
 strand (*shore*), strand (*fibre*).
 strain (*v. and s.*), strain (*a breed*).
 strait (*narrow*), straight (*upright*).
 stroke (*a blow*), stroke (*fondle*).
 stoop, stoop.
 shed (*scatter*), shed (*shelter*).
 tart (*adj.*), tart (*a pie*).
 tyre (*of wheel*), tire (*fatigue*).
 tire (*attire*), + tier (*who ties*).
 time, thyme.
 tap (*to strike*), tap (*short pipe*).
 tale, tail, tail (*estate in t.*).
 tender (*adj.*), tender (*s., attender*).
 tent (*pavilion*), tent (*plug of lint*,
s. and v.), tent (*wine*).
 tare, tear (*v.*).
 teem, team.
 tear (*eye*), tier.
 tick (*bedding*), tick (*sheep*), tick
 (*clock*), tic (*spasm*), tick (*credit*).
 till (*cash drawer*), till (*until*).
 tilt (*v., to make aslant*), tilt (*tour-
 ney*), tilt (*of caravan*).
 tip (*top*) tip (*make to slant*), tip
 (*a gift*).
 toe, tow (*hemp*), tow (*draw a
 boat*).
 two, too, to.
 toll (*tax*), toll (*of bells*).
 taut, taught, tort.
 toil (*labour*), toil (*a snare*).
 top (*summit*), top (*a toy*).
 truck (*vehicle*), truck (*naut.*).
 truck (*barter*).
 trump (*trumpet*), trump (*at cards*).
 trunk (*box*), trunk (*of tree*),
 trunk (*of elephant*).
 tray, trait.
 trace (*track*), trace (*strap*).
 chair, chare.
 chap (*crack*), chap (*chapman*).
 chap (*cheek*).
 char (*burn*), char (*fish*), char
 (*-woman*).
 chop (*with hatchet*), chop (*and
 change*).
 chuck (*chick*), chuck (*strike
 gently*).
 chase (*hunt*), chase (*enchase*),
 chase (*printer's case*), chase
 (*groove*).
 vice (*depravity*), vice (*clench*).
 vice (*deputy*).
 valley, valet.
 van (*front of army*), van (*fan*),
 van (*caravan*).
 vale, vail, veil.
 vain, vein, vane.
 won, one.
 wake (*awake*), wake (*watch*).
 wake (*of ship*).
 wain, wane.
 waste, waist.
 wait, weight.
 wave, waive.
 well (*good*), well (*spring*).
 wee, we.
 weak, week.
 ween, wean.
 war, wore.
 would, wood.

☞ And see Addenda, TRACT IV, pp. 32, 33.

II. All the following examples involve *wh.* > *w.*¹

ware (<i>earthen-</i>), ware	while, wile.	whet, wet.
(<i>aware</i>), wear,	whine, wine.	whirr, were = wer'.
where, were.	white, wight.	whin, win.
way, weigh, whey.	whether, weather.	whist, wist.
waif, wale, whale.	whither, wither.	which, witch, wych (<i>elm</i>).
weal (<i>wealth</i>), weal	whig, wig.	whorl, wall, waul.
(<i>as swelling</i>), wheel.	whit, wit.	whoop, hoop.
weald, wield, wheeled.	what, wot.	

III. Group of Homophones caused by loss of trilled R.³

ion, iron.	talk, torque.	laud, lord.
father, farther.	daw, door.	maw, more.
lava, larva.	flaw, floor.	gnaw, nor.
halm, harm.	yaw, yo're.	raw, roar.
calve, carve.	law, lore.	shaw, shore.

IV. The name of a species (of animals, plants, &c.) is often a homophone. Where there is only one alternative meaning, this causes so little inconvenience that the following names (being in that condition) have been excluded from List I.²

bleak (<i>fish</i>), bleak (<i>adj.</i>).	pout (<i>fish</i>), pout (<i>v.</i>).
dace, dais.	perch (<i>fish</i>), perch (<i>alight</i>).
gull (<i>bird</i>), gull (<i>s. and v.</i>).	plaice, place.
carp, carp (<i>v.</i>).	ray (<i>fish</i>), ray (<i>of light</i>).
cod, cod (<i>husk</i>).	rook (<i>bird</i>), rook (<i>v.</i>).
codling, coddling (fr. <i>coddle</i>).	skua, skewer.
flounder (<i>fish</i>), flounder (<i>v.</i>).	skate (<i>fish</i>), skate (<i>on ice</i>).
quail (<i>bird</i>), quail (<i>v.</i>).	smelt (<i>fish</i>), smelt (fr. <i>smell</i>).
lark (<i>bird</i>), lark (<i>fun</i>).	swift (<i>bird</i>), swift (<i>adj.</i>).
ling (<i>fish</i>), ling (<i>heather</i>).	swallow (<i>bird</i>), swallow (<i>throat</i>).
mussel, muscle.	tapir, taper.
nit, knit.	tern, turn.
awk, orc.	teal (<i>fish</i>), teal (<i>tree</i>).
oriole, aureole.	thrush (<i>bird</i>), thrush (<i>disease</i>).
pike (<i>fish</i>), pike (<i>weapon</i>).	

¹ The following words in List I involve *wr* > *w*, write, wrach, wrap, wring, wrung, wreck, wrest, wreak, wrick.

² Other similar proper names of species, &c., which occur in some one of the other sections of the list: ant, bat, bear, bee, beet, beetle, beech, box, breeze, date, dock, daw, duck, deer, elder, erne, fir, flea, flag, fluke, hare, horse, hawk, hop, caper, carrot, couch, cricket, currant, leech, lichen, mace, maize, mint, mole, pear, peach, pink, pie, pine, plum, plane, pulse, rabbit, rye, rush, rape, rail, reed, roe, roc, rue, sage, seal, sloe, sole, spruce, stork, thyme, char, whale, whin, yew. Also cockle.

³ Other similar words occurring in other sections are—awe, awl, ought,

V. The suffix *er* added to a root often makes homophones.
The following are examples. (And see in List VI.)

byre, buyer (<i>who buys</i>).	medlar, meddler.
butter (<i>s.</i>), butter (<i>who butts</i>).	moulder (<i>v.</i>), moulder (<i>who moulds</i>).
better (<i>adj.</i>), better (<i>who bets</i>).	
border, boarder.	pitcher (<i>vessel</i>), pitcher (<i>who pitches</i>).
dire, dyer.	
founder (<i>v.</i>), founder (<i>who ~ founds</i>).	pillar, piller.
geyser, gazer.	platter, plaiter.
greater, grater (<i>nutmeg</i>).	plumper (<i>adj.</i>), plumper (<i>s.</i>).
canter (<i>pace</i>), canter (<i>who ~ cants</i>).	sounder (<i>adj.</i>), sounder (<i>who ~ sounds</i>).
	cellar, seller, &c.

VI. Words excluded from the main list for various reasons,
their homophony being rightly questioned by many
speakers.

actor, acta (<i>sanc- torum</i>).	literal, littoral.	rancour, ranker.
brute, bruit.	marshal, martial.	succour, sucker.
direst, diarist.	minor, miner.	sailor, sailer.
descent, dissent.	manor, manner.	cellar, seller.
deviser, divisor.	medal, meddle.	censor, censer.
dual, duel.	metal, mettle.	surplus, surplice.
goffer, golfer.	missal, missel (<i>thrush</i>).	symbol, cymbal.
carrot, carat.	orphan, often.	skip, skep.
caudle, caudal.	putty, puttee.	tuber, tuba.
choler, collar.	pedal, peddle.	whirl, whorl.
compliment, comple- ment.	police, pelisse.	wert, wort (<i>herb, obs.</i>).
lumber, lumbar.	principal, principle.	vial, viol.
lesson, lessen.	profit, prophet.	verdure, verger (<i>in Jones</i>).
	rigour, rigger.	

VII. Homophones due only to an inflected form of a word.
Comparatives of adjectives, &c.

adze, adds.	baize, bays (<i>bis</i>).
art (<i>s.</i>), art (<i>v.</i>).	bent, bent (<i>pp. bend</i>).
bard, barred.	bean, been.
band, banned.	blue, blew.
battels, battles (<i>bis</i>).	bode, bowed.
baste, based.	bold, bowled, bolled (<i>obs.</i>).

bawd, fought, gaud, gauze, haw, caw, cause, caught, lawn, paw, saw, sauce, sought, taut, caulk, stalk, alms, balm;—their correspondents being, oar, orle, ort (*obs.*), board, fort, gored, gores, hoar, core, cores, court, lorn, pore, sore, source, sort, tort, cork, stork, arms, barm.

bald, bawled.	cause, cores, caws.
braid, brayed.	coir, coyer (fr. <i>cøy</i>).
bread, bred.	crew (s.), crew (fr. <i>crow</i>).
brood, brewed.	quartz, quarts.
bruise, brews.	lighter (s.), lighter (fr. <i>light</i> , <i>adj.</i>).
depouse, dépôts.	lax, lacks, &c.
divers (<i>adj.</i>), divers (<i>plu.</i>).	lapse, laps, &c.
dug (<i>teat</i>), dug (fr. <i>dig</i>).	lade (<i>v.</i>), laid.
duct, ducked.	lane, lain.
dust, dost.	lead (<i>mineral</i>), led.
daze, days.	left (<i>adj.</i>), left (fr. <i>leave</i>).
daisies, dazes (<i>both inflected</i>).	Lent, leaned, lent (fr. <i>lend</i>).
doze, does (<i>plu. of doe</i>).	least, leased.
aloud, allowed.	lees (<i>of wine</i>), leas, &c.
fort, fought.	lynx, links.
found (<i>v.</i>), found (fr. <i>find</i>)	mind, minded.
phase, fays (<i>pl. of fay</i>).	maddei (<i>plant</i>), madder (fr. <i>mad</i>).
felt (<i>stuff</i>), felt (fr. <i>feel</i>).	mustard, mustered.
furze, firs, and furs.	maid, made.
feed (<i>s. and v.</i>), fee'd.	mist, missed.
flatter (<i>v.</i>), flatter (<i>adj.</i>).	mode, mowed.
phlox, flocks.	moan, mown.
phrase, fiays.	new, knew, &c.
guise, guys (<i>plu.</i>).	nose, knows, noes.
gaud, gored.	aught (<i>a whit</i>), ought (fr. <i>ewe</i>).
gauze, gores.	pact, packed.
guest, guessed.	paste, paced.
glose, glows.	pervade, purveyed.
ground (<i>s.</i>), ground (fr. <i>grind</i>).	pyx, picks.
graze, greys.	please, pleas.
greaves, grieves.	pause, paws, pores.
groan, grown.	pride, pried [<i>bis</i>].
grocer, grosser.	prize, pries.
hire, higher.	praise, prays, preys.
herd, heard.	rouse, rows.
hist! hissed.	rasher (<i>bacon</i>), rasher (fr. <i>rash</i>).
hose, hoes.	raid, rayed.
hawse (<i>naut.</i>), haws, &c	red, read (<i>p. of to read</i>).
eaves, eves.	rex, wrecks, recks.
use (<i>v.</i>), ewes, yews.	road, rode, rowed.
candid, candied.	rote, wrote.
clove (<i>s.</i>), clove (fr. <i>cleave</i>).	rove (<i>v. of rover</i>), rove (fr. <i>reeve</i>).
clause, claws.	rose, rows (<i>var.</i>), roes (<i>var.</i>),
cold, coaled.	rose (<i>v.</i>).
courser, coarser.	ruse, rues (fr. <i>rue</i>).
court, caught.	side, sighed.

size, sighs.	tract, tracked.
scene, seen.	trust, trussed.
seize, seas, sees.	chaste, chased (<i>various</i>).
sold, soled (<i>both inflected</i>).	choose, chews.
sword, soared.	throne, thrown.
sort, sought.	through, threw.
span (<i>length</i>), span (<i>fr. spin</i>).	wild, wiled.
spoke (<i>of wheel</i>), spoke (<i>fr. speak</i>).	wind (<i>roll</i>), whined.
stole (<i>s.</i>), stole (<i>fr. steal</i>).	wax, whacks.
stove (<i>s.</i>), stove (<i>fr. stave</i>).	wade, weighed.
tide, tied.	weld, welled.
tax, tacks (<i>various</i>).	word, whirred.
tact, tacked.	wilt (<i>wither</i>), wilt (<i>fr. will</i>).
tease, teas, tees.	ward, warred.
toad, towed, toed.	wont, won't.
told, tolled.	warn, worn.

VIII. 'False homophones' [see p. 4], doubtful doublets, &c.

beam, beam (<i>of light</i>).	litter (<i>brood</i>), litter (<i>straw</i>).
bit (<i>horse</i>), bit (<i>piece</i>), bit (<i>fr. bite</i>).	mantle (<i>cloak</i>), mantle (<i>shelf</i>).
brace, brace.	mess (<i>confusion</i>), mess (<i>table</i>).
diet, diet.	mussel, muscle.
deck (<i>cover</i>), deck (<i>adorn</i>).	nail (<i>unguis</i>), nail (<i>clavus</i>).
deal (<i>various</i>).	patent (<i>open</i>), patent (<i>monopoly</i>).
dram (<i>drink</i>), drachm.	pommel (<i>s.</i>), pummel (<i>v.</i>).
drone (<i>insect</i>), drone (<i>sound</i>).	refrain (<i>v.</i>), refrain (<i>s., in verse</i>).
jest, gest (<i>romance, and obs. senses</i>).	retort (<i>reply</i>), retort (<i>chemical vessel</i>).
jib (<i>sail</i>), jib (<i>of horses</i>).	second (<i>number</i>), second (<i>of time</i>).
fine (<i>adj., v. senses</i>), fine (<i>mult.</i>).	squall (<i>v.</i>), squall (<i>a gale</i>).
flower, flour.	slab (<i>s.</i>), slab (<i>adj.</i>).
fleet (<i>s.</i>), fleet (<i>adj.</i>), Fleet (<i>stream</i>).	smart (<i>s. and v., sting</i>), smart (<i>adj.</i>).
grain (<i>corn</i>), grain (<i>fibre</i>).	stave (<i>of barrel</i>), stave (<i>of music</i>).
indite, indict.	[<i>stave in (v.)</i>].
incense (<i>v. = cense</i>), incense (<i>incite</i>).	stick (<i>s.</i>), stick (<i>v.</i>).
kind (<i>adj.</i>), kind (<i>s.</i>).	stock (<i>stone</i>), stock (<i>in trade</i>), &c.
canvas, canvass.	strut (<i>a support</i>), strut (<i>to walk</i>).
cuff (<i>sleeve</i>), cuff (<i>strike</i>).	share (<i>division</i>), share (<i>plough</i>).
cousin, cozen.	sheet (<i>sail and clew</i>), sheet (<i>-anchor</i>).
cord, chord (<i>music</i>)	shear (<i>clip</i>), sheer (<i>clear</i>), sheer off (<i>deviate</i>).
coin, coign.	tack (<i>various</i>), tack (<i>naut.</i>).
cotton (<i>s.</i>), cotton (<i>v.</i>).	ton, tun.
crank (<i>s.</i>), crank (<i>adj.</i>).	wage (<i>earnings</i>), wage (<i>of war</i>).
quaver (<i>v.</i>), quaver (<i>music</i>).	
levy, levee.	

IX. The following words were not admitted into the main class chiefly on account of their unimportance.

ah! are.	yawl (<i>boat</i>), yawl (<i>howl</i>).
arse, ass.	coup, coo.
ask, aske (<i>newel</i>)	lamb, lam (<i>bang</i>).
ayah, ire.	loaf, loaf (<i>v. laufsen</i>).
bah! bar, baa.	marry! marry (<i>v.</i>).
barb, barb (<i>horse</i>).	nag (<i>pony</i>), nag (<i>to gnaw</i>), knag.
bask, basque.	nap (<i>of cloth</i>), nap (<i>sleep</i>).
barn, barne = bairn.	nay, neigh.
budge, budge (<i>stuff</i>).	oh! owe.
buff, buff.	ode, owed.
buffer, buffer.	oxide, ox-eyed.
berg, burgh (<i>suffixes</i>).	pax, packs.
bin, bin = been.	pants, pants (<i>fi. pant</i>).
broke (<i>v. of broker</i>), broke (<i>fr. break</i>).	pose, pros (<i>and cons</i>).
broom, brume (<i>fog</i>).	sink (<i>var.</i>), cinque.
darn, darn.	swayed, suède (<i>kid</i>).
fizz, phiz.	ternary, turnery.
few, feu.	tea, tee (<i>starting point</i>).
forty, forte.	taw (<i>to dress skins</i>), taw (<i>game, marbles</i>), tore (<i>fr. tear</i>)
hay, heigh!	cheap, cheep.
hem (<i>sew</i>), hem (<i>v., haw</i>).	tool, tulle.
hollow, hollo (<i>v.</i>).	wo! woe.
inn, in.	ho! hoe.

The facts of the case being now sufficiently supplied by the above list, I will put my attitude towards those facts in a logical sequence under separate statements, which thus isolated will, if examined one by one, avoid the confusion that their interdependence might otherwise occasion. The sequence is thus:

1. Homophones are a nuisance.
2. They are exceptionally frequent in English.
3. They are self-destructive, and tend to become obsolete.
4. This loss impoverishes the language.
5. This impoverishment is now proceeding owing to the prevalence of the Southern English standard of speech.
6. The mischief is being worsened and propagated by the phoneticians.
7. The Southern English dialect has no claim to exclusive preference.

1. *That homophones are a nuisance.*

An objector who should plead that homophones are not a nuisance might allege the longevity of the Chinese language, composed, I believe, chiefly of homophones distinguished from each other by an accentuation which must be delicate difficult and precarious. I remember that Max Müller [1864] instanced a fictitious sentence

ba bà bá bá,

‘which (he wrote) is said to mean if properly accented *The three ladies gave a box on the ear to the favourite of the princess.*’ This suggests that the bleating of sheep may have a richer significance than we are accustomed to suppose; and it may perhaps illustrate the origin as well as the decay of human speech. The only question that it raises for us is the possibility of distinguishing our own homophones by accentuation or by slight differentiation of vowels; and this may prove to be in some cases the practical solution, but it is not now the point in discussion, for no one will deny that such delicate distinctions are both inconvenient and dangerous, and should only be adopted if forced upon us. I shall assume that common sense and universal experience exonerate me from wasting words on the proof that homophones are mischievous, and I will give my one example in a note¹; but it is a fit place for some general remarks.

The objections to homophones are of two kinds, either scientific and utilitarian, or æsthetic. The utilitarian objec-

¹ The homophones sun = son. There is a Greek epigram on Homer, wherein, among other fine things, he is styled,

Ἐλλάνων βιοτῆ δεύτερον ἀέλιον

which Mackail translates ‘a second sun on the life of Greece’. But *second son* in English means the second male child of its parents. It is plain that the Greek is untranslatable into English because of the homophone. *The thing cannot be said.*

Donne would take this bull by the horns, pretending or thinking that genuine feeling can be worthily carried in a pun. So that in his impassioned ‘hymn to God the Father’, deplored his own sinfulness, his climax is

But swear by thyself that at my death Thy Sonne
Shall shine as he shines now,

the only poetic force of which seems to lie in a covert plea of pitiable imbecility.

Dr. Henry Bradley in 1913 informed the International Historical Congress that the word *son* had ceased to be vernacular in the dialects of many parts of England. ‘I would not venture to assert (he adds) that the identity of sound with *sun* is the only cause that has led to the widespread disuse of *son* in dialect speech, but I think it has certainly contributed to the result.’

Utilitarian
objections
not con-
fined to
homo-
phones.

tions are manifest, and since confusion of words is not confined to homophones, the practical inconvenience that is sometimes occasioned by slight similarities may properly be alleged to illustrate and enforce the argument. I will give only one example.

The telephone, which seems to lower the value of differentiating consonants, has revealed unsuspected likenesses. For instance the ciphers, if written somewhat phonetically as usually pronounced, are thus:

○ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

nawt wun too three fawr faiv six sev'n eit nain
by which it will be seen that the ten names contain eight but only eight different vowels, 0 and 4 having the same vowel *aw*, while 5 and 9 have *ai*. Both these pairs caused confusion; the first of them was cured by substituting the name of the letter O for the name of the zero cipher, which happens to be identical with it in form,¹ and this introduced a ninth vowel sound *ou* (= *owe*), but the other pair remained such a constant source of error, that persons who had their house put on the general telephonic system would request the Post Office to give them a number that did not contain a 9 or a 5; and it is pretty certain that had not the system of automatic dialling, which was invented for quite another purpose, got rid of the trouble, one of these two ciphers would have changed its name at the Post Office.

Æsthetic
objections.

In the effect of uniformity it may be said that utilitarian and æsthetic considerations are generally at one; and this blank statement must here suffice, for the principle could not be briefly dealt with: but it follows from it that the proper æsthetic objections to homophones are never clearly separable from the scientific. I submit the following considerations. Any one who seriously attempts to write well-sounding English will be aware how delicately sensitive our ear is to the repetition of sounds. He will often have found it necessary to change some unimportant word because its accented vowel recalled and jarred with another which was perhaps as far as two or three lines removed from it: nor does there seem to be any rule for this, since apparently similar repetitions do not always offend, and may even be

¹ There is a coincidence of accidents—that the Arabic sign for zero is the same with our letter O, and that the name of our letter O (= *owe*) is the same as the present tense of *ought*, which is the vulgar name (for *nought*) of the Arabic zero, and that its vowel does not occur in the name of any cipher.

agreeable. The relation of the sound to the meaning is indefinable, but in homophones it is blatant; for instance the common expression *It is well* could not be used in a paragraph where the word *well* (= well-spring) had occurred. Now, this being so, it is very inconvenient to find the omnipresent words *no* and *know* excluding each other: and the same is true of *sea* and *see*; if you are writing of the *sea* then the verb *to see* is forbidden, or at least needs some handling.

I see the deep's untrampled floor
With green and purple seaweeds strewn:

here *seaweeds* is risky, but *I see the sea's untrampled floor* would have been impossible: even the familiar

The sea saw that and fled

is almost comical, especially because 'sea saw' has a most compromising joint-tenant in the children's rocking game

See saw Margery daw.

The awkwardness of these English homophones is much increased by the absence of inflection, and I suppose it was the richness of their inflections which made the Greeks so indifferent (apparently) to syllabic recurrences that displease us: moreover, the likeness in sound between their similar syllables was much obscured by a verbal accent which respected the inflection and disregarded the stem, whereas our accent is generally faithful to the root.¹ This sensitiveness

¹ Wherever this is not so—as in *rhétoric*, *rhetorical*, *rhetorician*, *company*, *compánion*, &c.—we have a greater freedom in the use of the words. Such words, as Dr. Bradley points out, giving *Canada*, *Canadian* as example, are often phonetic varieties due to an imported foreign syntax, and their pronunciation implies familiarity with literature and the written forms: but very often they are purely the result of our native syllabising, not only in displacement of accent (as in the first example above) but also by modification of the accented vowel according to its position in the word, the general tendency being to make long vowels in monosyllables and in penultimate accents, but short vowels in antepenultimate accents. Thus come such differences of sound between *opus* and *opera*, *ocean* and *ominous*, *virus* and *virulent*, *miser* and *miserable*, *nation* and *national*, *patron* and *patronage*, *legal* and *legislate*, *grave* and *gravity*, *globe* and *globular*, *grade* and *gradual*, *genus* and *general*, *female* and *feminine*, *fable* and *fabulous*, &c. In such disguising of the root-sound the main effect, as Dr. Bradley says, is the power to free the derivative from an intense meaning of the root; so that, to take his very forcible example, the adjective *Christian*, the derivative of *Christ*, has by virtue of its shortened vowel been enabled to carry a much looser signification than it could have acquired had it been phonetically indissociable from the intense signification of the name *Christ*. This freedom of the derivative from the root varies indefinitely in different words, and it

to the sound of syllables is of the essence of our best English, and where the effect is most magical in our great poets it is impossible to analyse.

Once become sensible of such beauty, and of the force of sounds, a writer will find himself in trouble with *no* and *know*. These omnipresent words are each of them essentially weakened by the existence of the other, while their proximity in a sentence is now damaging. It is a misfortune that our Southern dialect should have parted entirely with all the original differentiation between them ; for after the distinctive *k* of the verb was dropped, the negative still preserved (as it in some dialects still preserves) its broad open vowel, more like *law* than *toe* or *beau*, and unless that be restored I should judge that the verb *to know* is doomed. The third person singular of its present tense is *nose*, and its past tense is *new*, and the whole inconvenience is too radical and perpetual to be received all over the world. We have an occasional escape by using *nay* for *no*, since its homophone *neigh* is an unlikely *neighbour* ; but that can serve only in one limited use of the word, and is no solution.

Punnage.

In talking with friends the common plea that I have heard for homophones is their usefulness to the punster. 'Why ! would you have no puns ?' I will not answer that question ; but there is no fear of our being insufficiently catered for ; whatever accidental benefit be derivable from homophones, we shall always command it fully and in excess ; look again at the portentous list of them ! And since the essential jocularity of a pun (at least when it makes me laugh) lies in a humorous incongruity, its farcical gaiety may be heightened by a queer pronunciation. I cannot pretend to judge a sophisticated taste ; but, to give an example, if, as I should urge, the *o* of the word *petrol* should be preserved, as it is now universally spoken, not having yet degraded into *petr'l*, a future squire will not be disqualified from airing his wit to his visitors by saying, as he points to his old stables, 'that is where I store-my petrel', and when the joke had been illustrated in *Punch*, its folly would sufficiently distract the patients in a dentist's waiting-room for years to come, in spite of gentlemen and chauffeurs continuing to say *petrol*, as

very much complicates my present lesser statement of the literary advantage of phonetic variety in inflexions and derivatives.

The examples above are all Latin words, and since Latin words came into English through different channels, these particular vowels can have different histories.

they do now; nor would the two *petr's* be more dissimilar than the two *mys*.

Puns must of course be distinguished from such a play on words as John of Gaunt makes with his own name in Shakespeare's *King Richard II*. Play on words.

K. What comfort man? How is't with aged Gaunt?

G. O, how that name befits my composition!

Old Gaunt indeed, and gaunt in being old, &c.

where, as he explains,

Misery makes sport to mock itself.

This is a humorous indulgence of fancy, led on by the associations of a word; a pun is led off by the *sound* of a word in pursuit of nonsense; though the variety of its ingenuity may refuse so simple a definition.

It is true that a real good may sometimes come indirectly from a word being a homophone, because its inconvenience in common parlance may help to drive it into a corner where it can be retained for a special signification: and since the special significance of any word is its first merit, and the coinage of new words for special differentiation is difficult and rare, we may rightly welcome any fortuitous means for their provision. Examples of words specialized thus from homophones are *brief* (a lawyer's brief), *hose* (water-pipe), *bolt* (of door), *mail* (postal), *poll* (election), &c.¹

An indirect advantage of homophones.

2. *That English is exceptionally burdened with homophones.*

This is a reckless assertion; it may be that among the languages unknown to me there are some that are as much hampered with homophones as we are. I readily grant that with all our embarrassment of riches, we cannot compete with the Chinese nor pretend to have outbuilt their Babel; but I doubt whether the statement can be questioned if confined to European languages. I must rely on the evidence of my list, and I would here apologize for its incompleteness. After I had patiently extracted it from the

¹ It would follow that, supposing there were any expert academic control, it might be possible to save some of our perishing homophones by artificial specialization. Such words are needed, and if a homophone were thus specialized in some department of life or thought, then a slight differential pronunciation would be readily adopted. Both that and its defined meaning might be true to its history.

dictionary a good many common words that were missing occurred to me now and again, and though I have added these, there must be still many omissions. Nor must it be forgotten that, had obsolete words been included, the total would have been far higher. That must plainly be the case if, as I contend, homophony causes obsolescence, and référénce to the list from Shakespeare in my next section will provide examples of such words.

Otto Jespersen¹ seems to think that the inconvenience of homophones is so great that a language will naturally evolve some phonetic habit to guard itself against them, although it would otherwise neglect such distinction. I wish that this admirable instinct were more evident in English. He writes thus of the lists of words which he gives 'to show what pairs of homonyms [homophones] would be created if distinctions were abolished that are now maintained: they [the lists] thus demonstrate the force of resistance opposed to some of the sound-changes which one might imagine as happening in the future. A language can tolerate only a certain number of ambiguities arising from words of the same sound having different significations, and therefore the extent to which a language has utilized some phonetic distinction to keep words apart, has some influence in determining the direction of its sound-changes. In French, and still more in English, it is easy to enumerate long lists of pairs of words differing from each other only by the presence or absence of voice in the last sound; therefore final *b* and *p*, *d* and *t*, *g* and *k*, are kept rigidly apart; in German, on the other hand, there are very few such pairs, and thus nothing counterbalances the natural tendency to unvoice final consonants.'

3. *That homophones are self-destructive and tend to become obsolete.*

For the contrary contention, namely, that homophones do not destroy themselves, there is *prima facie* evidence in the long list of survivors, and in the fact that a vast number of words which have not this disadvantage are equally gone out of use.

Words fall out of use for other reasons than homophony, therefore one cannot in any one case assume that ambiguity

Causes of
obsoles-
cence.

¹ *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, by Otto Jespersen, Heidelberg, 1909. Streitberg's *Germanische Bibliothek*, vol. 1, p. 441.

of meaning was the active cause: indeed the mere familiarity of the sound might prolong a word's life; and homophones are themselves frequently made just in this way, for un-educated speakers will more readily adapt a familiar sound to a new meaning (as when my gardener called his Pomeranian dog a *Panorama*) than take the trouble to observe and preserve the differentiation of a new sound. There is no rule except that any loss of distinction may be a first step towards total loss.¹

It is probable that the working machinery of an average man's brain sets a practical limit to his convenient workable vocabulary; that is to say, a man who can easily command the spontaneous use of a certain number of words cannot much increase it without effort. If that is so, then, as he learns new words, there will be a tendency, if not a necessity, for him to lose hold of a corresponding number of his old words; and the words that will first drop out will be those with which he had hitherto been uncomfortable; and among those words will be the words of ambiguous meaning.

It is plain that only general considerations can be of value, unless there should be very special evidence in any special case; and thus the caution of Dr. Henry Bradley's remarks in note on page 19.

No direct proof.

I remember how I first came to recognize this law; it was from hearing a friend advocating the freer use of certain old words which, though they were called obsolete and are now rarely heard, yet survive in local dialects. I was surprised to find how many of them were unfit for resuscitation because of their homophonic ambiguity, and when I spoke of my discovery to a philological friend, I found that he regarded it as a familiar and unquestioned rule.

But to prove this rule is difficult; and as it is an impossible task to collect all the obsolete words and classify them, I am proposing to take two independent indications; first to separate out the homophones from the other obsolete words in a Shakespearian glossary, and secondly, to put together

¹ To give an example of this. In old Greek *we* and *you* were *ημεις* and *υμεις*: and those words became absolutely homophonous, so that one of them had to go. The first person naturally held on to its private property, and it invented *σεις* for outsiders. Now the first step towards this absurdest of all homophonies, the identity of *neum* and *tuum*, was no doubt the modification of the true full *u* to *u*. The ultimate convenience of the result may in itself be applauded; but it is inconceivable that modern Greek should ever compensate itself for its inevitable estrangement from its ancient glories.

a few words that seem to be actually going out of use in the present day, that is, strictly obsolescent words caught in the act of flitting.

Obso-
lēscence
defined.

Obsolescence in this connexion must be understood only of common educated speech, that is, the average speaker's vocabulary. Obsolescent words are old words which, when heard in talk, will sound literary or unusual: in literature they can seem at home, and will often give freshness without affectation; indeed, any word that has an honourable place in Shakespeare or the Bible can never quite die, and may perhaps some day recover its old vitality.

Evidence
of obso-
lēscence.

The best evidence of the obsolescence of any word is that it should still be frequently heard in some proverb or phrase, but never out of it. The homophonic condition is like that of *aural* and *oral*, of which it is impossible to make practical use.¹ We speak of an *aural surgeon* and of *oral teaching*, but out of such combinations the words have no sense. It happens that oral teaching must be aural on the pupil's side, but that only adds to the confusion.

In deciding whether any obsolete homophone has been lost by its homophony, I should make much of the consideration whether the word had supplied a real need, by naming a conception that no other word so fitly represented; hence its survival in a proverb is of special value, because the words of proverbs are both apt and popular; so that for the disuse of such a word there would seem to be no other cause so likely and sufficient as damage to its signification.

The glossary is relied on to contain, besides its other items, all the obsolete words: the homophones separated out from these will show various grades of obsolescence, and very different values as examples bearing on the question at issue.

Table of homophones taken from among the obsolete words in Cunliffe's 'A New Shakespearean Dictionary,' Blackie, 1910.

ancient: replaced by ensign.

bate = remit.

beck = a bow of the head: preserved in 'becks and nods', mutual loss with *beck* = rivulet.

boot = to profit: Sh. puns on it, showing that its absurdity was recognized.

bottle (of hay): preserved in proverb.

bourne = streamlet: preserved

¹ The words *aural* and *oral* are distinguished in the pronunciation of the North Midlands and in Scotland, and the difference between the first syllables is shown in the Oxford dictionary. In Southern English no trace of differentiation remains.

in sense of limit by the line of Sh. which perhaps destroyed it.

breeze = gadfly.

brief (*subs.*): now only as a lawyer's brief.

brook (*verb*).

buck = to steep (linen) in lye.

cote : as in sheepcote.

dole = portion, and **dole** = sorrow: probably active mutual destruction; we still retain 'to dole out'.

dout.

dun (*adj.*): now only in combination as dun-coloured.

ear = to plough.

fain and **feign**: prob. mutual loss due to undefined sense of fain. n.b. *fane* also obsolete.

feat (*adj.*) and **featly** : well lost.

fere.

fit = section of a poem.

flaw: now confined to a flaw in metal, &c.

fleet (*verb*) and **fleeting**, as in the sun-dial motto, 'Time like this shade doth fleet and fade.'

foil: common verb, obsolete.

gest: lost in *jest*.

gird = to scoff: an old well-established word.

gout = a drop of liquor.

gust = taste (well lost).

hale = haul (well lost).

hight = named.

hoar: only kept in combination, hoar-frost, hoar hairs.

hose: lost, though hosier remains, but specialized in *garden-hose*, &c.

hue: not now used of colour.

imbruised (with blood): prob. lost in *brewed*.

jade: almost confined to *jaded* (?).

keel = cool.

list : as in 'as you list'.

mail: now only in combination, coat of mail, &c.

marry!

mated = confused in mind (well lost).

meed: lost in *mead* = meadow (also obs.) and *mead* = methé-glin.

mete and **metely** = fitting, also *mete* in 'mete it out', both lost in *meet* and *meat*.

mere (*subs.*).

mouse (*verb*): to bite and tear.

mow = a grimace.

muse = to wonder: lost in *amuse* and *Muse*.

neat = ox.

ounce = pard.

pall = to fail.

peak: survives only in 'peak and pine' and in *peaky*.

petting = paltiy, also *pelt* = a skin, lost.

pill = to plunder.

pink = ornamental slashing of dress.

poke = pocket.

poll = to cut the hair.

quarry (as used in sport).

quean = a woman.

rack (of clouds).

raze (to the ground). The meaning being the very opposite of *raise*: the word *raze* is intolerable.

rede = counsel, n.b. change of meaning.

rheum: survives in rheumatic, &c.

scald = scurvy (*adj.*).

sleave = a skein of silk, 'The ravelled sleave of care', usually misinterpreted, the equivocal alternative making excellent sense.

souse (*verb*): of a bird of prey swooping.

speed: as in 'St. Francis be thy	speed' = help, aid.	tickle = unstable.
stale = bait or decoy (well lost).		tire = to dress (the hair, &c.).
tarre: to 'tarre a dog on' =		vail = to let fall.
incite.		wreak.

Besides the above may be noted

wont (*sub.*): lost in *won't* = will not.

fair: Though we still speak of 'a fair complexion' the word has lost much of its old use: and the verb to fare has suffered; we still say 'Farewell', but scarcely 'he fares ill'; also to fare forth is obsolete.

bolt = to sift, has gone out, also bolt in the sense of a missile weapon; but the weapon may have gone first; we still preserve it in 'a bolt from the blue', a thunder-bolt, and 'a fool's bolt is soon shot', and we shoot the bolt of a door.

barm: this being the name of an object which would be familiar only to brewers and bakers, probably suffered from the discontinuance of family brewing and baking. It would no longer be familiar, and may possibly have felt the blurring effect of the ill-defined balm, which word also seems rarely used. In the South of England few persons now know what barm is.

arch: *adj.*, probably obsolescent.

There are also examples of words with the affix *a-*, or initials simulating that affix, thus:

aby: lost in *abide*, with which it was confused.

abode = bode (? whether ever in common use)

accite: lost in *excite*.

assay: quite a common word, lost in *say* (?)

atone: lost in *tone*.

and thus *attempt*, *attaint*, *attest*, *avail*, all suffered from *tempt*, *taint*, *test*, *veil*, whereas *attend* seems to have destroyed *tend*.

*Table of homophones that may seem to be presently falling out of use.*¹

ail.	bier.	cession.	dun (<i>colour</i>).
alms.	bray (<i>pound</i>).	cite.	desert.
ascent.	bridal.	clime.	fain.
augur (<i>v.</i>).	broach.	corse.	fallow.
barren.	casque.	cruse.	feign.
bate.	cede.	dene.	fell (<i>skin</i>).

¹ Some of the words in this table are also in the last list. This list is an attempt to tabulate words falling out of use or seldom heard now in the conversation of average educated persons who talk Southern English or what is called P. S. P. (see p. 38); to some of them the word may be unknown, and if it is known, they avoid using it because it sounds to them strange or affected. It is difficult to *prove* that any particular word is in this condition, and the list is offered tentatively. It is made from Jones'

flue (<i>velu</i>).	march (<i>bound-ary</i>).	rail (<i>chide</i>).	surge.
fray (<i>sub.</i>).		raze.	swift.
fry (<i>small-</i>).	meed.	reave.	teem.
gait.	mien.	reck.	toil (<i>snare</i>).
gambol.	mote.	repair (<i>resort</i>).	vane.
gin (<i>snare</i>).	mourn.	rheum.	van (<i>fan</i>).
gird (<i>abuse</i>).	mute (<i>of birds</i>).	rood.	vail (<i>v.</i>).
gore (<i>blood</i>).	neat (<i>animal</i>).	rue.	wage (<i>war</i>).
hart.	ore.	sack (<i>v.</i>).	wain.
horde.	pale (<i>enclosure</i>).	sage (<i>adj.</i>).	ween.
hue (<i>colour</i>).	pall (<i>v.</i>).	sallow (<i>willow</i>).	whit.
isle.	pen (<i>enclose</i>).	sere.	wight.
lea.	pelt (<i>skin</i>).	soar.	wile.
lessen.	pile (<i>hair</i>).	spray (<i>sprig</i>).	wrack.
let (<i>hinder</i>).	pink (<i>v.</i>).	still (<i>adj. n.b.</i> <i>keep still</i>).	wreak.
lief.	pulse (<i>pease</i>).		wot.
main.	quean.	stoup.	aught.

4. *That the loss due to homophony threatens to impoverish the language.*

New words are being added to the dictionary much faster than old words are passing out of use, but it is not a question of numbers nor of dictionaries. A chemist told me that if the world were packed all over with bottles as close as they could stand, he could put a different substance into each one and label it. And science is active in all her laboratories and will print her labels. If one should admit that as many as ninety-nine per cent. of these artificial names are neither literary nor social words, yet some of them are, since everything that comes into common use must have a name that is frequently spoken. Thus *baik*, *sackereen*, and *mahjereen* are truly new English word-sounds; and it may be, if we succumb to anarchical communism, that margarine and saccharine will be lauded by its dissolute mumpers as enthusiastically as men have hitherto praised and are still praising butter and honey. 'Bike' certainly would have already won a decent place in poetry had it been

dictionary, which is therefore allowed to rule whether the word is obsolescent rather than obsolete: some of these seem to be truly obsolete. Some will appear to be convincing examples of obsolescence, others not; but it must be remembered that the fact of a word being still commonly heard in some district or trade (though that may seem to show that it is in 'common use') is no evidence that it is not dying out; it is rather evidence that it was lately more living, which is the same as being obsolescent.

christened more gracefully and not nicknamed off to live in backyards with cab and bus. The whole subject of new terms is too vast to be parenthetically handled, and I hope that some one will deal with it competently in an early publication of the S. P. E. The question must here remain to be determined by the evidence of the words in the table of obsoletes, which I think is convincing ; my overruling contention being that, however successful we may be in the coinage of new words (and we have no reason to boast of success) and however desirable it is to get rid of some of the bad useless homophones, yet we cannot afford to part with any old term that can conveniently be saved.

We have the best Bible in the world, and in Shakespeare the greatest poet ; we have been suckled on those twin breasts, and our children must have degenerated if they need asses' milk. Nor is it only because the old is better than the new that we think thus. If we speak more proudly of Trafalgar than of Zeebrugge, it is not because Trafalgar is so far finer a sounding word than Zeebrugge, as indeed it is, nor because we believe that the men of Nelson's time were better than our men of to-day, we know they were not, but because the spirit that lives on ideals will honour its parents ; and it is thinking in this way that makes noble action instinctive and easy. Nelson was present at Zeebrugge leading our sailors, as Shakespeare is with us leading our writers, and no one who neglects the rich inheritance to which Englishmen are born is likely ever to do any credit to himself or his country.

5. *That the South English dialect is a direct and chief cause of homophones.*

Evidence
of Jones'
dictionary.

Evidence of the present condition of our ruling educated speech in the South of England I shall take from Mr. Daniel Jones' dictionary,¹ the authority of which cannot, I think, be disputed. It is true that it represents a pronunciation so bad that its slovenliness is likely to be thought overdone, but there is no more exaggeration than any economical

¹ *A Phonetic Dictionary of the English Language*, by Hermann Michaelis, Headmaster of the Mittelschule in Berlin, and Daniel Jones, M.A., Lecturer on Phonetics at University College, London, 1913. There is a second edition of this book in which the words are in the accustomed alphabetical order of their literary spelling.

system of phonetic spelling is bound to show. It is indeed a strong and proper objection to all such simplifications that they are unable to exhibit the finer distinctions ; but this must not imply that Mr. Jones' ear is lacking in delicate perception, or that he is an incompetent observer. If he says, as he does say, that the second syllable in the words *obloquy* and *parasite* are spoken by educated Londoners with the same vowel-sound (which he denotes by $\mathbf{\theta}$, that is the sound of *er* in the word *danger*), then it is true that they are so pronounced, or at least so similarly that a trained ear refuses to distinguish them [óblerquy, pársite].

To this an objector might fairly reply that Mr. Jones could distinguish the two sounds very well if it suited him to do so ; but that, as it is impossible for him to note them in his defective phonetic script, he prefers to confuse them. I shall not lose sight of this point,¹ but here I will only say that, if there really is a difference between these two vowels in common talk, then if Mr. Jones can afford to disregard it it must be practically negligible, and other phoneticians will equally disregard it, as the Oxford Press has in its smaller dictionary.

I suppose that thirty years ago it would have been almost impossible to find any German who could speak English so well as to pass for a native : they spoke as Du Maurier delighted to represent them in *Punch*. During the late war, however, it has been no uncommon thing for a German soldier to disguise himself in English uniform and enter our trenches, relying on his mastery of our tongue to escape suspicion ; and it was generally observed how many German prisoners spoke English *like a native*. Now this was wholly due to their having been taught Southern English on Mr. Jones' model and method.

Again, those who would repudiate the facts that I am about to reveal, and who will not believe that in their own careless talk they themselves actually pronounce the words very much as Mr. Jones prints them,² should remember

Its trustworthiness.

¹ I am not likely to forget it or to minimize it, for it is my own indictment against Mr. Jones' system, and since his practice strongly supports my contention I shall examine it and expose it (see p. 43) ; but the objection here raised is not really subversive of my argument here, as may be judged from the fact that the Oxford University Press has adopted or countenanced Mr. Jones' standard in their small popular edition of the large dictionary.

² This is a very common condition. The habitual pronunciation is associated in the mind with the familiar eye-picture of the literary printed spelling so closely that it is difficult for the speaker to believe that he is not

that the sounds of speech are now mechanically recorded and reproduced, and the records can be compared; so that it would betray incompetence for any one in Mr. Jones' position to misrepresent the facts, as it would be folly in him to go to the trouble and expense of making such a bogus book as his would be were it untrue; nor could he have attained his expert reputation had he committed such a folly.

Again, and in support of the trustworthiness of the records, I am told by those concerned in the business that for some years past no Englishman could obtain employment in Germany as teacher of English unless he spoke the English vowels according to the standard of Mr. Jones' dictionary; and it was a recognized device, when such an appointment was being considered, to request the applicant to speak into a machine and send the record by post to the Continent; whereupon he was approved or not on that head by the agreement of the record with the standard which I am about to illustrate from the dictionary.

All these considerations make a strong case for the truth of Mr. Jones' representation of our 'standard English', and his book is the most trustworthy evidence at my disposal: but before exhibiting it I would premise that our present fashionable dialect is not to be considered as the wanton local creator of all the faults that Mr. Jones can parade before the eye. Its qualities have come together in various ways, nor are the leading characteristics of recent origin. I am convinced that our so-called standard English sprang actively to the fore in Shakespeare's time, that in the Commonwealth years our speech was in as perilous a condition as it is to-day, and at the Restoration made a self-conscious recovery, under an impulse very like that which is moving me at the present moment; for I do not look upon myself as expressing a personal conviction so much as interpreting a general feeling, shared I know by almost all who speak our tongue, Americans, Australians, Canadians,

uttering the written sounds; but he is not competent to judge his own speech. For instance, almost all Englishmen believe that the vowel which we write *u* in *but*, *ugly*, *unknown*, &c., is really a *u*, like the *u* in *full*, and not a disguised *a*; and because the written *s* is sometimes voiced they cannot distinguish between *s* and *z*, nor without great difficulty separate among the plural terminations those that are spoken with an *s* from those that are spoken with a *z*. I was shocked when I first discovered my own delusions in such matters, and I still speak the bad Southern English that I learnt as a child and at school. I can hardly forgive my teachers and would not myself be condemned in a like reprobation.

Irish, New Zealanders, and Scotch, whom I range alphabetically lest I should be thought to show prejudice or bias in any direction. But this is beyond the present purpose, which is merely to exhibit the tendency which this so-called degradation has to create homophones.

As no one will deny that homophones are to be made by Mauling of words words, I will begin by a selection of words from Mr. Jones' dictionary showing what our Southern English is doing with the language. I shall give in the first column the word with its literary spelling, in the second Mr. Jones' phonetic representation of it, and in the third column an attempt to represent that sound to the eye of those who cannot read the phonetic script, using such makeshift spellings as may be found in any novel where the pronunciation of the different speakers is differentiated.

Examples from Mr. Jones' Pronouncing Dictionary.¹

parsonage.	pa:snidz [-sn-]	pahs'nidge or pahs-nidge.
picture.	piktʃe	pictsher.
scriptural.	skriptʃərl	scriptscherel or scriptshrl.
temperature.	tempritʃe	tempritsher.
interest.	intrist	intrist.
senator.	senitə and senətor	senniter and senner-tor.
blossoming.	bləsəmɪŋ	blosserming.
natural.	nætʃrəl	natshrerl or natshrl.
orator.	ɔrətə	orrerter.
rapturous.	ræptʃərəs	raptshers or rapt-shrers.
parasite.	pærəsait	parrersite.
obloquy.	əbləkwi	oblerquy.
syllogise.	siledʒaiz	sillergize.
equivocal.	ikwivəkəl	ikwivveɪk'l.
immaterial.	imətɪərl	immertierel.
miniature.	minitʃə	minnitsher.
extraordinary.	ikstro:dnri	ikstrordnry.
salute.	selu:t [-lju:-]	serloot and serlute.
solution.	selu:ʃən [-lju:-]	serloosh'n and ser-lush'n.
subordinate (<i>adj.</i>).	sebə:dnit	serbord'nit.
sublime.	seblaim	serblime.

¹ The dictionary allows mitigated variants of some of these words.

In culling these flowers of speech I was not blind to their great picturesque merits, but they must not be taken for jokes, at least they must not be thought of as conjuring smiles on the faces of Messrs. Jones, Michaelis and Rippmann: they are deadly products of honest study and method, and serious evidence whereby any one should be convinced that such a standard of English pronunciation is likely to create homophones: and yet in searching the dictionary I have not found it guilty of many new ones.¹ For examples of homophones due to our 'standard' speech one might take first the 20 *wh*- words (given on page 14) which have lost their aspirate, and with them the 9 *wr*- words: next the 36 words in table iv and note, which have lost their trilled *R*: and then the 41 words from table vi on page 15; and that would start us with some 100 words, the confusion of which is due to our Southern English pronunciation, since the differentiation of all these words is still preserved in other dialects. The differentiation of these 100 words would of course liberate their twins, so the total number of gains should be doubled.

Example
of one
class

But number is not so important as the quality and frequency of the words involved, so I will instance one class in detail, namely the words in which *aw* and *or* are confused. Here are a dozen of them :

core	= caw.	oar, ore	= awe*.
door	= daw*.	pore	= paw.
floor	= flaw*.	roar	= raw.
hoar*	= haw.	soar, sore	= saw, saw.
lore*	= law.	tore	= taw.
more	= maw*.	yore*	= yaw.

Of these 12 words, 6 exhibit stages or symptoms of obsolescence. I should think it extremely unlikely that *yore* has been in any way incommoded by *yaw*; and *flaw*, which is now more or less cornered to one of its various meanings, was probably affected more by its own ambiguities than by *floor*; but others seem to be probable examples: *shaw* and *lore*, and I think *maw*, are truly obsolete, while *hoar* and *daw* are heard only in combination. *Awe* is heard only in *awful*, and has there lost its significance. I should

¹ A fair list might no doubt be made; the most amusing item would be—*Ophelia* = *aphelia*: then *illusion* = *elusion*, *paten* = *pattern*, *seaman* = *seamen*, *phial* = *file*, *custody* = *custardy*, and of course *verdure* = *verger* and *fissure* = *fisher*. It would also allow *partition* = *petition*, *proscribe* = *prescribe*, and *upbraid* = *abrade*. I take these from the first edition.

guess that this accident has strengthened its severity in literature, where it asserts its aloofness sometimes with a full spelling [*awful*] as in speech two pronunciations are recognized, *awful* and *awf'l*.

Now how do these words appear in Jones' dictionary? If there is to be any difference between the *aw* and *ore* sounds either the *R* must be trilled as it still is in the north, or some vestige of it must be indicated, and such indication would be a lengthening of the *o* (= *aw*) sound by the vestigial voicing of the lost trill, such as is indicated in the word *o'er*, and might be roughly shown to the eye by such a spelling as *shawer* for *shore* [thus *shaw* would be *ʃɔ:* and *shore* would be *ʃɔ:ə*] and such distinction is still made by our more careful Southern English speakers, and is recognized as an existent variant by Jones.

Since the circumflex accent properly indicates a rise and fall of voice-pitch on a vowel-sound such as almost makes a disyllable of a monosyllable (e.g. in Milton's verse the word *power* may fill either one or two places in the line) I will adopt it here to denote this fuller and differentiating pronunciation of *ore*.

Now to all these words, and to the finals of such words as *adôrë*, *implôrë*, *ignôrë*, Jones gives the diphthongal *aw* as the normal South English pronunciation, and he allows the longer *ôrë* sound only as a variant, putting this variant in the second place.

Hence, all these *ôrë* words are being encouraged to cast off the last remnant of their differentiation, which it is admitted that they have not yet quite lost.¹

¹ The two editions of Jones' dictionary do not exactly correspond, e.g. in the first edition the words *boar* and *bore* are under *baw*, and no other pronunciation is mentioned. But in the second edition *bôrë* and *boâr* are allowed as variants. In the first edition *four*, *fore*, and *for* are all under *faʊ* [fɔ:], and I find *pour*, *poe*, and *poor* all under *paw*, though in every case there are variants, and on p. 404 he records that *shore* and *sure* may be pronounced alike. Again, in the first edition, *yerr* [jɔ:] is one normal for *year* and also dialectal for *ear* (!), while in the second edition only *year* [jɪ:ə] is given for *year*, and *yerr* is not mentioned at all. As I am sure that this sort of stuff must be almost more tedious and annoying to read than it is to write, I desist from further details, but cannot resist the opportunity of pointing out that in their English pronunciation of Latin our classical teachers and professors have wantonly introduced this mischievous homophony of *au* and *o* into Latin, although the proper pronunciation of the 'diphthong' *au* in Latin is not like our *awe*, but like the *ou* of *out*. Thus with them *corda* and *cauda* are similar sounds, and the sacred *Sursum corda* means 'Cock your tail' just as much as it means 'Lift up your hearts'.

6. *That the mischief is being propagated by phoneticians.*

The use of phonetics in education.

The phoneticians are doing useful work in supplying an educational need. By the phonetic system any spoken language can now be learned quickly and easily, just as by the *sol-fa* system the teaching of music was made easy and simple. If a clergyman who had no practical knowledge of music were offered the post of minor canon in a cathedral, he would find it very difficult to qualify himself passably, whereas any village schoolboy could learn all the music necessary for such an office, and learn that solidly too and soundly and durably, in a few lessons, truly in a few hours, by the *sol-fa* method. The principle is the same in music and in speech, namely to have a distinct symbol for every separate sound; in music it is a name, the idea of which quickly becomes indissociable from the note of the scale which it indicates; in phonetics it is a written letter, which differs from the units of our literary alphabet only in this, that it has but one meaning and interpretation, and really is what all letters were originally intended to be. When you see it you know what it means.

Its general adoption certain.

The principle is but common sense, and practice confirms its validity. I am persuaded that as soon as competition has exposed the advantages which it ensures, not only in the saving of time, but in the rescuing of English children from the blighting fog through which their tender minds are now forced to struggle on the first threshold of life,¹ then all spoken languages will be taught on that method. What now chiefly hinders its immediate introduction is not so much the real difficulty of providing a good simple system, as the false fear that all our literature may take on the phonetic dress; and this imagination is frightful enough

¹ This is no exaggeration. Let a humane teacher think what an infant's mind is, the delicate bud of intelligence opening on the world, eager to adjust its awakening wonder to the realities of life, absolutely simple, truthful, and receptive, reaching out its tender faculties like the sensitive antennae of a new-born insect, that feel forth upon the unknown with the faultless instinct of eternal mind—one has only to imagine that condition to realize that the most ingenious malignity could hardly contrive anything to offer it so perplexing, cramping, and discouraging as the unintelligible and unreasonable absurdities of English literary spelling. That it somehow generally wrestles through is only a demonstration of the wrong that is done to it; and I would say, better leave it alone to find its own way, better teach it nothing at all, than worry it with the incomprehensible, indefensible confusion of such nonsense.

to be a bugbear to reasonable people, although, so far as one can see, there is no more danger of this result than there is of all music appearing in sol-fa notation.

Now here is a promising field for adventure. Not only is the creation of a new fount of type an elaborate and expensive process, but the elaboration of a good system and its public recognition when produced involve much time; so that any industrial company that is early in the market with a complete apparatus and a sufficient reputation will carry all before it, and be in a position to command and secure great monetary profit. Demand of the market.

There is no doubt that the field is now strongly held by the Anglo-Prussian society which Mr. Jones represents.¹

In the preceding section Mr. Jones' dictionary was taken as authority for the actual condition of Southern English pronunciation. It must now be considered in its other aspect, namely as the authoritative phonetic interpretation of our speech; my contention being that it is a wrong and mischievous interpretation.

It is difficult to keep these two questions quite apart.

¹ The peril that we are in of having Mr. Jones' degraded pronunciation thus sprung upon us in England and taught in all our schools is really threatening. Indeed, as things are, there is little prospect of escaping from it, supposing the democracy should once awake to the commercial and spiritual advantages of teaching language phonetically: and that would seem to be only a question of time: the demand may come at any moment, and a complete machinery which has been skilfully prepared to meet the demand will offer practical conveniences to outbalance every other consideration.

Even supposing the authorities in the Education Department sufficiently alive to the situation which it is the purpose of this section of my essay to bring to the fore, yet even then, were they all unanimous, they could not give effect to their convictions, because—

They are forbidden to recommend or give preference to any particular book. They may not order or prohibit the use of any book, however good or bad they may know it to be, and they probably desire to avoid the suspicion of favouring the authors of books that have the advantage of national circulation.

However that may be, it is a lamentable situation that our high-salaried Board of Education, composed of the best trained intelligence of the country, should not be allowed to exercise its discretion efficiently. The people, no doubt, cannot be agreed as to the principles on which they desire to be educated, whether political, official, or religious, and they deprecate official control in such matters. Every one objecting to some principle, they consent in requiring that the central authority should have no principle at all, but this lack of principle should not be extended to paralyse action in questions that demand expert knowledge and judgement, such as this question of phonetic teaching—and it shows that the public by grudging authority to their own officers may only fall under a worse tyranny, which they will suffer just because it has no authority.

The first, which was dealt with in Section 5, was that Southern English is actively productive of homophones. This present Section 6 is contending that the mischief is being encouraged and propagated by the phoneticians, and Mr. Jones' books are taken as an example of their method.

Fault of
Mr. Jones,
method

The reason why the work of these phoneticians is so mischievous is that they have chosen too low a standard of pronunciation.

The defence that they would make would be something like this.

They might argue with some confidence, and not without a good show of reason, that the actual 'vernacular' talk of the people is the living language of any country: they would allege that a spoken language is always changing, and always will change; that the actual condition of it is the only scientific, and indeed the only possible basis for any system of tuition; and that it is better to be rather in advance of change than behind it, since the changes proceed inevitably by laws which education has no power to resist, nay, so inevitably that science can in some measure foresee the future.

This would, I suppose, fairly represent Mr. Jones' contention. Indeed, he plainly asserts that his work is merely a record of existing facts, and he even says that he chose Southern English because it is most familiar and observable, and therefore capable of providing him with sufficient phenomena: and he might say that what I call 'low' in his standard is only the record of a stage of progression which I happen to dislike or have not nearly observed. And yet the argument is full of fallacies: and the very position that he assumes appears to me to be unsound. It is well enough to record a dialect, nor will any one grudge him credit for his observation and diligence, but to reduce a dialect to theoretic laws and then impose those laws upon the speakers of it is surely a monstrous step. And in this particular instance the matter is complicated by the fact that Southern English is not truly a natural dialect; Mr. Jones himself denotes it as P. S. P.=Public School Pronunciation, and that we know to be very largely a social convention dependent on fashion and education, and inasmuch as it is a product of fashion and education it is not bound by the theoretical laws which Mr. Jones would attribute to it; while for the same reason it is unfortunately susceptible of being affected by them, if they should be taught with authority. These

phoneticians would abuse a false position which they have unwarrantably created. This Southern English, this P. S. P., is a 'fashionable' speech, fashionable that is in two senses ; and Mr. Jones would fashion it.

But I wish to put my case practically, and, rather than argue, I would ask what are the results of learning English on Mr. Jones' system ? What would be the condition of a man who had learnt in this way ?

I shall assume that the pupil has learnt his pronunciation from the dictionary, the nature of which is now known to my readers : but they should also know that Mr. Jones recognizes and teaches three different styles, which he calls the A, B, and C styles, 'A, the pronunciation suitable for recitation or reading in public ; B, the pronunciation used in careful conversation, or reading aloud in private ; and C, the pronunciation used in rapid conversation.'

In a polemic against Mr Jones his adversary has therefore to combat a dragon with three heads, and the heroic method would be to strike all three of them off at one blow. To effect this it seems to me that one has only to remark that a system which is forced to teach a dialect [a dialect, observe, not a language] in three forms where one is sufficient, is *ipso facto* condemned. This objection I will establish presently ; at present I am content to confine my attention to one head, for I maintain that in practice those who will take the trouble to learn three forms of one speech must be a negligible number ; the practical pupils will generally be content to master one, and that will, no doubt, be the highly recommended style B, and its corresponding dictionary ; they will rule out A and C as works of supererogation ; and indeed those would be needless if B were satisfactory.

So, then, we are asking what is the condition of a man who has learned the dictionary standard ?

(1) In common talk if we speak so indistinctly as not to be understood, we repeat our sentence with a more careful articulation. As Sweet used to say, the only security against the decay of language through careless articulation into absolute unintelligibility is the personal inconvenience of having to repeat your words when you are indistinctly heard. 'What' leaps out from the dictionary with a shout to the rescue of all his fellows. And when you have experienced this warcry 'what? what?' oftener than you like, you will raise the standard of your pronunciation (just

judged by
practical
effects.

His three
styles.

In deliber-
ate repeti-
tions.

as you would raise your voice to a deaf listener) merely to save yourself trouble, even though you were insensible to the shame of the affront.

In asseveration.

And this more careful articulation obtains also in all *asseveration*. A speaker who wishes to provoke attention to any particular statement or sentiment will speak the words by which he would convey it more slowly and with more careful articulation than the rest of his utterance.

Under both these common conditions the man who has learned only the vernacular of Mr. Jones' phonetics has no resource but to emphasize with all their full horrors words like *seprit*, *sin'kerpate*, *din'erssty*, *ernoin't*, *mis'ernthrop*, *sym'perthy*, *mel'ernkerly*, *mel'erdy*, *serspe'ct*, *erno'y*, &c.¹, which when spoken indistinctly in careless talk may pass muster, but when accurately articulated are not only vulgar and absurd, but often unrecognizable.

In public speaking.

(2) Again, public speakers use a pronunciation very different from that in the dictionary, and Mr. Jones admits this and would teach it *sepritly* as 'style A'. But it is wrong to suppose that its characteristics are a mere fashion or a pedantic regard for things obsolete, or a nice rhetorical grace, though Mr. Jones will have it to be mostly artificial, 'due to well-established, though perhaps somewhat arbitrary rules laid down by teachers of elocution'. The basis of it is the need of being heard and understood, together with the experience that style B will not answer that purpose. The main service, no doubt, of a teacher of elocution is to instruct in the management of the voice (clergyman's sore throat is a recognized disease of men who use their voice wrongly); but a right pronunciation is almost equally necessary and important.

Now if public speakers really have to learn something different from their habitual pronunciation, Mr. Jones is right in making a separate style of it, and he is also justified in the degraded forms of his style B, for those are what these speakers have to unlearn; nor is any fault to be found with his diligent and admirable analysis.

These two practical considerations expose the situation sufficiently: we may now face the triple-tongued dragon and exhibit how a single whiff of common sense will tumble all his three heads in the dust.

The insideoutness, topsy-turviness, and preposterousness of Mr. Jones' method is incredible. In the natural order of

The natural right method.

¹ Writing *er*, always unaccented, for *ə*.

things, children would be taught a careful 'high standard' articulation as a part of their elemental training, when in their pliant age they are mastering the co-ordinations which are so difficult to acquire later. Then when they have been educated to speak correctly, their variation from that full pronunciation is a natural carelessness, and has the grace of all natural behaviour, and it naturally obeys whatever laws have been correctly propounded by phoneticians; since it is itself the phenomena from which those laws are deduced. This carelessness or ease of speech will vary naturally *in all degrees* according to occasion, and being dependent on mood and temper will never go wrong. It is warm and alive with expression of character, and may pass quite unselfconsciously from the grace of negligence to the grace of correctness, for it has correctness at command, having learned it, and its carelessness has not been doctored and bandaged; and this ease of unselfconsciousness is one of the essentials of human intercourse: a man talking fluently does not consider what words he will use, he does not often remember exactly what words he has used, nor will he know at all how he pronounces them; his speech flows from him as his blood flows when his flesh is wounded.

What
Mr Jones
would sub-
stitute.

What would Mr. Jones' system substitute for this natural grace? In place of a wide scale of unconscious variation he provides his pupils with 'three styles', three different fixed grades of pronunciation,¹ which they must apply consciously as suits the occasion. At dinner you might be called on to talk to a bishop across the table in your best style B, or to an archbishop even in your A 1, when you were talking to your neighbours in your best C.—Nature would no doubt assert herself and secure a fair blend; but none the less, the three styles are plainly alternatives and to some extent mutually exclusive, whereas natural varieties are harmoniously interwoven and essentially one.

Argumentative analogies are commonly chosen because they are specious rather than just; but there is one here which I cannot forbear. If a system like Mr. Jones' were adopted in teaching children to write, we should begin by collecting and comparing all the careless and hasty handwritings of the middle class and deduce from them the prevalent forms of the letters in that state of degradation. From this we should construct in our 'style B' the alphabet which we

¹ Of course Mr. Jones knows that these are not and cannot be fixed. He must often bewail in secret the exigencies of his 'styles'.

should contend to be the genuine natural product of inevitable law, and hallowed by 'general use', and this we should give to our children to copy and learn, relegating the more carefully formed writing to a 'style A, taught by writing masters', explaining that its 'peculiarities' were 'modifications produced involuntarily as the result of writing more slowly or endeavouring to write more distinctly', &c.¹

I believe that there has never been in Europe a fluent script so beautiful and legible as that of our very best English writers of to-day. But their aesthetic mastery has come from loving study of the forms that conscious artistry had perfected, and through a constant practice in their harmonious adaptation.

Finally, it may be worth while to raise the question how it can be that a man of Mr. Jones' extreme competence in his science should commit himself to a position that appears so false and mischievous.

Reason of present discredit of phonetics.

The unpopularity of phonetics is not wholly undeserved: from its early elements, the comfortably broad distinctions of convincing importance, it has progressed to a stage of almost infinite differentiations and subtleties; and when machinery was called in to dispose of controversy, a new and unsuspected mass of baffling detail was revealed.

The subject cannot be treated parenthetically, nor am I capable of summarizing it; but it seems clear that the complexity of the science has driven off public sympathy and dashed the confidence of scholars, withdrawing thereby some of the wholesome checks that common sense might else have imposed on its practical exponents. The experts thus left to themselves in despair of any satisfactory solution, are likely enough to adopt the simplifications most agreeable to their present ideas; and measure the utility of such simplifications by the accidental conveniences of their own science, independently of other considerations.

The practical difficulty.

The main practical difficulty which they have to meet in providing a reasonably satisfactory phonetic script or type for the English language is this, that the symbols of their alphabet must not greatly exceed in number those of the

¹ *Phonetic Transcriptions of English*, by D. Jones, 1907, Introd., p. v. 'The peculiarities of Style A as compared with Style B are especially marked. These differences are partly natural, i. e. modifications produced involuntarily as the result of speaking more slowly or of endeavouring to speak more distinctly, and partly artificial, i. e. modifications due to the well-established though perhaps somewhat arbitrary rules laid down by teachers of elocution,' &c., and Mr. Jones is quite right in complaining that his pupils make fools of themselves when they try to speak slower.

literary alphabet, whereas the sounds that they have to indicate do greatly exceed.

This discrepancy might be overcome by the use of what are called 'diacritical' marks, but here the universal prejudice against accents in English is forbidding, and it is true that even if printers did not rebel against them, they are yet distasteful and deterrent to readers out of all proportion to their complexity.

Mr. Jones no doubt allowed himself as much liberty as he could venture on, but to what has this paucity and choice of symbols led him? It has led him to assert and teach that an unaccented vowel in English retains no trace of its proper quality¹: that is, that you cannot, or at least do not, modify an unaccented vowel; you either pronounce *a*, *e*, *o*, *u*, distinctly, or you must substitute an alien sound, generally 'er', or in some consonantal positions a short 'i'. Thus we have *parersite*, *oblerquy*, *ikse:pt*, *ikspre:ss*, *iquidter*, *peri'sherner*, *peri'ce*, *spe'sherlize*, *pin'erkl*, *Mes'erpertd'mier*, &c., and one of his examples, which he advances with the confidence of complete satisfaction, is the name *Margate*, which he asserts is pronounced *Margit*,² that is, with a short *i*. The vowel is no doubt short, and its shortness is enforced by its being closed by a *t*: but it is not a short *i*, it is an extremely hastened and therefore disguised form of the original and proper diphthong *ei* (heard in *bait* and *gate*); and the true way to write it phonetically would be *ei*, with some diacritical sign to show that it was obscured. There is no long vowel or diphthong in English which cannot in some positions be pronounced short; and when hurried over between accents it is easy to see that there is nothing, except an obstacle of consonants, which can prevent the shortening of any syllable; for long and short are relative, and when you are speaking very slowly 'short' sounds actually occupy as much time as 'long' sounds do when you are speaking quickly. You have therefore only to suppose a speed of utterance somewhat out of scale; and this is just what happens. In the second syllable of *Margate* the diphthong is hastened and obscured, but a trace

The result
of Mr.
Jones'
solution.

The true
condition
of modi-
fied
vowels,
&c.

¹ I do not deny that he allows some exceptions: and these, few as they are, concede the principle for which I contend.

² His own words are, 'Thus Margate trippers now generally speak of *Mageit* instead of *Ma:git*: teachers in London elementary schools now often say *eksept* for *iksept* 'except', *ekstrə:dinəri* for *ikstrədnri* 'extraordinary', often for *ɔ:fn* 'often'. We feel that such artificialities cannot but impair the beauty of the language.' Dictionary, 1st edition, Preface, p. v.

of its quality remains, and will more distinctly appear as you speak the word slower. And so in the case of unaccented short vowels that are hurried over between the accents in talking, they are disguised and lose quality, but in good speakers a trace of the original sound will remain (as in *parasite* and *obloquy*), where, on the ground of indistinctness, Mr. Jones introduces the symbol of an *alien unrelated* sound, a sound, that is, which is *distinctly wrong instead of being indistinctly right*: and this fault vitiates all his books. Economy of symbols has led him to perversity of pronunciation.¹

7. *On the claim that Southern English has to represent all British speech.*

On this head certainly I can write nothing worth reading. Whether there is any one with so wide a knowledge of all the main different forms of English now spoken, their historic development and chief characteristics, as to be able to summarize the situation convincingly, I do not know. I can only put a few of the most evident phenomena in the relation in which they happen to affect my judgement.

And first of all I put the small local holding which the Southern English dialect can claim on the map of the British Empire. It is plain that with such a narrow habitat it must show proof that it possesses very great relative superiorities before it can expect to be allowed even

¹ In the first edition of the Dictionary [1913] ə has only one interpretation, the illustration being the *a* of *about*. In the *Phonetic Transcriptions* [1907] it was the *er* of *over*, but in the new Dictionary [1917] ə has three interpretations with the following explanation: ‘ə varies noticeably according to its position in the word and in the sentence. In final positions it is often replaced (*sic*) by “ʌ” [= *u* of *up*], in other positions its quality varies considerably according to the nature of the surrounding sounds; the variations extend from almost “ʌ” to the half-close mixed position. Three different values may be heard in the words *china*, *cathedral*: in the latter word the second “ə” has a lower and more retracted tongue-position than the first ə.’

The value of ə when Mr. Jones first substituted it for a disguised unaccented vowel, was that the speaker might know what sound he had to produce. It was wrong, but it was definite. Mr. Jones would now make it less wrong by making it less definite. That is, in the place of something distinctly wrong we are offered something which has an offchance of being nearly right: but as it has entirely ousted and supplanted the original vowel I do not see how there is any means of interpreting it correctly. The *er* of *over* is a definite sound, and to print it where it was out of place was a definite error—to give it three interpretations makes it cover more ground: but its usurpations are still indefensible.

a hearing: and such a claim must lie in its superiority in some practical or ideal quality: further than that it might allege that it was the legitimate heir of our great literature, and in possession of the citadel, and in command of an extensive machinery for its propaganda.

Now, in my opinion it could not establish any one of these claims except the last, namely its central position and wide machinery.

I do not pretend to foresee the future, nor even to desire it in any particular form; but it seems to me probable that if the 'P. S. P.' continues its downward course as indicated by Mr. Jones, then, unless everything else worsens with it, so that it might maintain its relative flotation in a general confusion, it must fall to be disesteemed and repudiated, and give place to one or more other dialects which, by having better preserved the distinctions of pronunciation, will be not only more convenient vehicles of intercourse, but more truthful and intelligible interpreters of our great literature; and I believe this to be well illustrated by the conditions of our 'S. E.' homophones: and that something better should win the first place, I hold to be the most desirable of possible events. But perhaps our 'S. E.' is not yet so far committed to the process of decay as to be incapable of reform, and the machinery that we use for penetration may be used as well for organizing a reform and for enforcing it. There is as much fashion as inevitable law in our 'P. S. P.' or 'S. E.' talk, and if the fashion for a better, that is a more distinct and conservative, pronunciation should set in, then at the cost of a little temporary self-consciousness we might, in one generation, or at least in two, have things again very much as they were in Shakespeare's day. It is true that men are slaves to the naturalness of what is usual with them, and unable to imagine that the actual living condition of things in their own time is evanescent: nor do even students and scholars see that in the Elizabethan literature we have a perdurable gigantic picture which, among all stages of change, will persistently reassert itself, while any special characteristics of our own day, which seem so unalterable to us, are only a movement, which may no doubt be determining the next movement, but will leave no other trace of itself, at least no more than the peculiarities of the age of Queen Anne have left to us.

I have been told that the German experts believe that the Cockney form of English will eventually prevail. This

surprising opinion may rest on scientific grounds, but it seems to me that Cockney speech will be too universally unintelligible; and, should it actively develop, will be so out of relation with other and older forms of English as to be unable to compete.

I wish and hope that the subject of this section may provoke some expert to deal thoroughly with it. The strong feeling in America, in Australia, and in New Zealand, to say nothing of the proud dialects of our own islands, is in support of the common-sense view of the matter which I have here expressed.

SUMMARY

WHEN I consented to write this inaugural paper, I knew that my first duty would be to set an example of the attitude which the Society had proposed to take and hopes to maintain.

This Society was called into existence by the widespread interest in linguistic subjects which is growing on the public, and by the lamentable lack of any organized means for focussing opinion. It responds to that interest, and would supply that want.¹ There is no doubt that public opinion is altogether at sea in these matters, and its futility is betrayed and encouraged by the amateurish discussions and *obiter dicta* that are constantly appearing and reappearing in the newspapers. Our belief is that if facts and principles were clearly stated and thoroughly handled by experts, it would then be possible not only to utilize this impulse and gratify a wholesome appetite, but even to attract and organize a consensus of sound opinion which might influence and determine the practice of our best writers and speakers.

The Society absolutely repudiates the assumption of any sort of Academic authority or orthodoxy; it relies merely on statement of fact and free expression of educated opinion to assure the verdict of common sense; and it may illustrate this method to recapitulate the various special questions that have arisen from following it in this particular discussion concerning English homophones.

¹ Neither the British Academy nor the Academic Committee of the Royal Society of Literature has shown any tendency to recognize their duties and responsibilities in this department.

The main points are of course

(1) The actual condition of the English language with respect to homophones. [This is an example of statement of fact.]

(2) The serious nature of their inconvenience.

(3) The evidence that we are unconsciously increasing them.

(4) The consequent impoverishment of the language.

From these considerations the question must arise

(5) Whether it is not our duty to take steps to prevent the continuance and growth of this evil. [To give an example—the word *mourn*. If we persist in mispronouncing this word as *morn*, and make no distinction between *mourning* and *morning*, then that word will perish. We cannot afford to lose it: it is a good example of our best words, as may be seen by looking it up in the concordances to Shakespeare and the Bible: and what is true of this word is true of hundreds of others.]

(6) It is pointed out that our fashionable Southern English dialect, our Public School Pronunciation, is one chief source of this damage.

(7) Attention is called to the low standard of pronunciation adopted by our professional phoneticians, and to the falsity of their orthodox teaching.

(8) The damage to the language which is threatened by their activity is exposed.

(9) It is questioned how far it is possible to adopt living dialectal forms to save words that would otherwise perish.

(10) Respect for the traditions of neglected dialects is advocated.

(11) As to what differentiations of words should be insisted on [e. g. the *lore* = *law* class].

(12) The necessity of observing vowel distinctions in unaccented syllables. [e.g. Every one now pronounces the *o* in the new word *petrol*, and yet almost every one thinks it impossible to pronounce the *o* in the old word *symbol*; which is absurd.]

(13) The necessity for better phonetic teaching in our schools.

(14) The quality of the new words introduced into the language; and the distinction between mere scientific labels, and those names of common new objects which must be constantly spoken.

(15) The claims of the Southern English dialect to general acceptance is questioned.

(16) The general consideration that the spread of the English language over the world must accelerate the disuse and loss of the most inconvenient homophones.

These matters invite expert discussion, and it is our hope that every such question will receive due treatment from some one whose knowledge qualifies him to handle it ; and that when any principle or detail is definitely recognized as desirable, then the consensus of good writers and speakers will adopt it. This implies wide recognition, support, and co-operation ; and though the Society has already gone far to secure this, it may yet seem that the small aristocracy of letters will be insufficient to carry through such a wide reform of habit : but it should be remembered that they are the very same persons whose example maintains the existing fashions. And, again, when it is urged against us that the democratic Press is too firmly established in its traditions to be moved by such an influence, it is overlooked that the great majority of those who write for the Press, and maintain or even create the style by which it holds the public ear, are men of good education, whose minds are thoroughly susceptible to all intellectual notions, and often highly sensitive to aesthetic excellence. They are all of them in a sense trained experts, and though working under tyrannous conditions are no less alive in pride and self respect than those who command more leisure, and they will readily and eagerly follow where their circumstances might forbid them to lead. The conviction too that they are honourably assisting in preserving the best traditions of our language will add zest to their work ; while the peculiar field of it will provide a wholesome utilitarian test, which must be of good service to us by checking the affectations and pedantries into which it may be feared that such a society as the S. P. E. would conceivably lapse. Their co-operation is altogether desirable, and we believe attainable if it be not from the first assured.

R. B.

S. P. E.

TRACT N^{o.} III

A FEW

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS

By

Logan Pearsall Smith

EDITORIAL

CO-OPERATION OF MEMBERS, ETC.

REPORT TO EASTER, 1920



At the Clarendon Press

M DCCCC XXXII

First published 1920
Printed in Great Britain

A FEW PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS

THE principles of the Society for Pure English were stated in general terms in its preliminary pamphlet ; since, however, many questions have been asked about the application of these principles, a few suggestions about special points may be found useful. The Society does not attempt to dictate to its members ; it does, however, put forward its suggestions as worthy of serious consideration ; and, since they have received the approval of the best scientific judgement, it is hoped that they will be generally acceptable.

Some of them, when blankly stated, may seem trivial and unimportant ; but we neither expect nor desire to make any sudden and revolutionary changes. A language is an established means of communication, sanctioned by the general consent, and cannot be transformed at will. Language is, however, of itself always changing, and if there is hesitation between current usages, then choice becomes possible, and individuals may intervene with good effect ; for only by their preferences can the points in dispute be finally settled. It is important, therefore, that these preferences should be guided by right knowledge, and it is this right knowledge which the Society makes it its aim to provide. While, therefore, any particular ruling may seem unimportant, the principle on which that ruling is based is not so ; and its application in any special case will help to give it authority and force. The effect of even a small number of successful interventions will be to confirm right habits of choice, which may then, as new opportunities arise, be applied to further cases. Among the cases of linguistic usage which are varying and unfixed at the present time, and in which therefore a deliberate choice is possible, the following may be mentioned :

I. The Naturalization of Foreign Words.

There is no point on which usage is more uncertain and fluctuating than in regard to the words which we are always borrowing from foreign languages. Expression generally

lags behind thought, and we are now more than ever handicapped by the lack of convenient terms to describe the new discoveries, and new ways of thinking and feeling by which our lives are enriched and made interesting. It has been our national custom in the past to eke out our native resources by borrowing from other languages, especially from French, any words which we found ready to our needs; and until recent times, these words were soon made current and convenient by being assimilated and given English shapes and sounds. We still borrow as freely as ever; but half the benefit of this borrowing is lost to us, owing to our modern and pedantic attempts to preserve the foreign sounds and shapes of imported words, which make their current use unnecessarily difficult. Owing to our false taste in this matter many words which have been long naturalized in the language are being now put back into their foreign forms, and our speech is being thus gradually impoverished. This process of de-assimilation generally begins with the restoration of foreign accents to such words as have them in French; thus 'role' is now written 'rôle'*; 'debris', 'débris'; 'detour', 'détour'; 'depot', 'dépôt'; and the old words long established in our language, 'levee', 'naivety', now appear as 'levée', and 'naïveté'. The next step is to italicize these words, thus treating them as complete aliens, and thus we often see *rôle*, *dépôt*, &c. The very old English word 'rendezvous' is now printed *rendezvous*, and 'dilettante' and 'vogue' sometimes are printed in italics. Among other words which have been borrowed at various times and more or less naturalized, but which are now being driven out of the language, are the following: confrere, congee, cortege, dishabille, distract, ensemble, fête, flair, mellay (now *mélée*), nonchalance, provenance, renconter, &c. On the other hand, it is satisfactory to note that 'employee' appears to be taking the place of 'employé'.

The printing in italics and the restoration of foreign accents is accompanied by awkward attempts to revert to the foreign pronunciation of these words, which of course much lessens their usefulness in conversation. Sometimes this, as in *nuance*, or *timbre**, practically deprives us of a word which most of us are unable to pronounce correctly; sometimes it is merely absurd, as in 'envelope', where most people try to give a foreign sound to a word which

* For the words marked with an asterisk see notes on p. 10.

no one regards as an alien, and which has been anglicized in spelling for nearly two hundred years.

Members of our Society will, we hope, do what is in their power to stop this process of impoverishment, by writing and pronouncing as English such words as have already been naturalized, and when a new borrowing appears in two forms they will give their preference to the one which is most English. There are some who may even help to enrich the language by a bolder conquest of useful terms, and although they may suffer ridicule, they will suffer it in a good cause, and will only be sharing the short-lived denunciation which former innovators incurred when they borrowed so many concise and useful terms from France and Italy to enlarge and adorn our English speech. If we are to use foreign words (and, if we have no equivalents, we must use them) it is certainly much better that they should be incorporated in our language, and made available for common use. Words like 'garage' and 'nuance' and 'naivety' had much better be pronounced and written as English words, and there are others, like 'bouleverse' and 'bouleversement', whose partial borrowing might well be made complete; and a useful word like *malaise* could with advantage reassume the old form 'ma-lease' which it once possessed.

II. *Alien Plurals.*

The useless and pedantic process of de-assimilation takes other forms, one of the most common of which is the restoring their foreign plural forms to words borrowed from Greek, Latin, and Italian. No common noun is genuinely assimilated into our language and made available for the use of the whole community until it has an English plural, and thousands of indispensable words have been thus incorporated. We no longer write of *ideæ*, *chori*, *asyla*, *musea*, *sphinges*, *specimina* for *ideas*, *choruses*, *asylums*, *museums*, *sphinxes*, *specimens*, and the notion of returning to such plurals would seem barbarous and absurd. And yet this very process is now going on, and threatens us with deplorable results. *Sanatoria*, *memoranda*, *gymnasia* are now replacing *sanatoriums*, *memorandums*, and *gymnasiums*; *automata*, *formulae*, and *lacunæ* are taking the place of *automatons*, *formulas*, and *lacunas*; *indices* and *apices* of *indexes* and *apexes*, *miasmata* of *miasmas* or *miasms*; and

even forms like *lexica*, *rhododendra*, and *chimerae* have been recently noted in the writings of authors of repute

Some of these words are no doubt exceptions. *Memoranda* is preferable when used collectively, but the English plural is better in such a phrase as 'two different memorandums'. *Automata*, too, is sometimes collective; and *lacuna* always carries the suggestion of its classical meaning, which makes half the meaning of the word. So again, when the classical form is a scientific term, it is convenient and well to preserve its differentiation, e.g. *formulae* in science, or *foci* and *indices* in mathematics; but such uses create exceptions, and these should be recognized as exceptions, to a general rule that wherever there is choice then the English form is to be preferred: we should, for instance, say *bandits* and not *banditti*.

III. *æ* and *œ*.

The use of *æ* and *œ* in English words of classical origin was a pedantic innovation of the sixteenth century: in most words of common use *æ* and *œ* have been replaced by the simple *e*, and we no longer write *prævious*, *æternal*, *æra*, *æmulate*, *cælestial*, *æconomy*, &c. Since, however, those forms have a learned appearance, they are being now restored in many words which had been freed from them; *medieval* is commonly written *mediæval*; *primæval* and *co-æval* are beginning to make their appearance; *peony* is commonly written *pæony*, and the forms *sæcular*, *chimæra*, *hyæna*,¹ and *præternatural* have recently been noted. As this is more than a mere change in orthography, being in fact a part of the process of de-assimilation, members of our Society would do well to avoid the use of the archaic forms in all words which have become thoroughly English, and which are used without thought of their etymology. The matter is not so simple with regard to words of Latin or Greek derivation which are only understood by most people through their etymology; and for these it may be well to keep their etymologically transparent spelling, as *ætiology*, *æstrus*, &c. Whether learned words of this

¹ Shakespeare would have assisted the Hyena in her attempt to naturalize herself in England:

'I will laugh like a Hyen, and that when thou art inclined to sleep.'
A. Y. L., iv. 1. 156. [ED.]

kind, and classical names such as *Cæsar*, *Æschylus*, &c., should be spelt with vowels ligatured or divided (*Caesar*, *Aeschylus*), is a point about which present usage varies: and that usage does not always represent the taste of the writers who employ it. Mr. Horace Hart, in his *Rules for Compositors and Readers at the University Press, Oxford*, ruled that the combinations *ae* and *oe* should each be printed as two letters in Latin and Greek words and in English words of classical derivation, but this last injunction is plainly deduced from the practice of editors of Latin texts, and is an arbitrary rule in the interest of uniformity: it has the sanction and influence of the Clarendon Press, but is not universally accepted. Thus Dr. Henry Bradley writes, 'This question does not seem to me to be settled by the mere fact that all recent classical editors reject the ligatures, just as most of them reject other aids to pronunciation which the ancients had not, such as *j*, *v*, for consonantal *i*, *u*. Many printers have conformed the spelling of *English* words in this respect to the practice of editors of Latin texts. I confess my own preference is for adhering to the English tradition of the ligature, not only in English words, but even in Latin or Greek names quoted in an English context. If we write *ae*, *oe* in *Philae*, *Adelphoe*, we need the diaeresis in *Aglae*, *Pholoe*, and a name like *Aeaea* looks very funny in an English context. The editors of Latin texts are perfectly right in discarding the ligatures; but so they are also in writing *Iuuinalis*; Latin is one thing and English is another.'

IV. *Dying Words.*

Our language is always suffering another kind of impoverishment which is somewhat mysterious in its causes and perhaps impossible to prevent. This is the kind of blight which attacks many of our most ancient, beautiful, and expressive words, rendering them first of all unsuitable for colloquial use, though they may be still used in prose. Next they are driven out of the prose vocabulary into that of poetry, and at last removed into that limbo of archaisms and affectations to which so many beautiful but dead words of our language have been unhappily banished. It is not that these words lose their lustre, as many words lose it, by hackneyed use and common handling; the process is exactly

opposite; by not being used enough, the phosphorescence of decay seems to attack them, and give them a kind of shimmer which makes them seem too fine for common occasions. But once a word falls out of colloquial speech its life is threatened; it may linger on in literature, but its radiance, at first perhaps brighter, will gradually diminish, and it must sooner or later fade away, or live only as a conscious archaism. The fate of many beautiful old words like *teen* and *dole* and *meed* has thus been decided; they are now practically lost to the language, and can probably never be restored to common use.¹ It is, however, an interesting question, and one worthy of the consideration of our members, whether it may be possible, at its beginning, to stop this process of decay, whether a word at the moment when it begins to seem too poetical, might not perhaps be reclaimed for common speech by timely and not inappropriate usage, and thus saved, before it is too late, from the blight of over-expressiveness which will otherwise kill it in the end.

The usage in regard to these tainted words varies a good deal, though probably not so much as people generally think: some of them, like *delve* and *dwell*, still linger on in metaphors; and people will still speak of *delving* into their minds, and *dwelling* in thought, who would never think of *delving* in the garden, or *dwelling* in England; and we will call people *swine** or *hounds*, although we cannot use these words for the animals they more properly designate. We can speak of a *swift** punishment, but not a *swift* bird, or airplane, or steamer, and we *shun* a thought, but not a bore; and many similar instances could be given. Perhaps words of this kind cannot be saved from the unhappy doom which threatens them. It is not impossible,

¹ But concerning the words *dole* and *meed* see Tract II *On English Homophones*. Both these words have suffered through homophony. *Dole* is a terrible example. 1, a portion = deal; 2, grief = Fr. deuil, Lat. *dolor*; 3, decent, from the Latin *dolus*, Gk. δόλος. All three have been in wide use and have good authority; but neither 2 (which is presumably that which the writer intends) nor 3 can be restored, nor is it desirable that they should be, the sound having been specially isolated to a substantive and verb in the sense of No. 1.

Meed is likewise lost by homophony with 1 mead = meadow and 2 mead = metheglin: and it is a very serious loss. No 1 is almost extinct except among farmers and hay merchants, but the absurd ambiguity of No. 2 is effective.

Teen, the writer's third example, has shown recent signs of renewed vitality in literature. [Ed.]

* For the words marked with an asterisk see notes on p. 10.

on the other hand that, by a slight conscious effort, some of these words might still be saved ; and there may be, among our members, persons of sufficient courage to suffer, in a pious cause, the imputation of preciousity and affectation which such attempts involve. To the consideration of such persons we could recommend words like *maid*, *maiden*, *damsel*, *weep*, *bide*, *sojourn*, *seck*, *heinous*, *swift*, *chide**, and the many other excellent and expressive old words which are now falling into colloquial disuse.

There is one curious means by which the life of these words may be lengthened and by which, possibly, they may regain a current and colloquial use. They can be still used humorously and as it were in quotation marks ; words like *pelf*, *maiden*, *lad*, *damsel*, and many others are sometimes used in this way, which at any rate keeps them from falling into the limbo of silence. Whether any of them have by this means renewed their life would be an interesting subject of inquiry ; it is said that at Eton the good old word *usher*, used first only for humorous effect, has now found its way back into the common and colloquial speech of the school.

V. *Dialectal and Popular Words.*

Whether words may, by conscious effort, be preserved in colloquial usage is an unsolved question, though perhaps our Society may help to solve it ; there is, however, another and more certain benefit which its members, or at any rate such of them as are writers, may confer upon the language. There are many excellent words spoken in uneducated speech and dialect all about us, which would be valuable additions to our standard vocabulary if they could be given currency in it. Many of these are dying words like *bide*, *dight*, *blithe*, *malison*, *vengeance*, and since these are still spoken in other classes, it might be less difficult to restore them to educated speech. Others are old words like *thole* and *nesh* and *lew* and *mense* and *foison* and *fash* and *douce*, which have never been accepted into the standard English, or have long since vanished from it, in spite of their excellence and ancient history, and in spite of the fact that they have long been in current use in various districts. Others are new formations, coined in the ever-active mint of uneducated speech, and many of these, coming as they

* For the words marked with an asterisk see notes on p. 10.

do full of freshness and vigour out of the vivid popular imagination—words like *harum-scarum*, *gallivant*, *cankерous* and *pernickety*—or useful monosyllables and penny pieces of popular speech like *blight* and *nag* and *fun*—have already found their way into standard English. But there are many others which might with advantage be given a larger currency. This process of dialectal regeneration, as it is called, has been greatly aided in the past by men of letters, who have given a literary standing to the useful and picturesque vocabulary of their unlettered neighbours, and thus helped to reinforce with vivid terms our somewhat abstract and faded standard speech. We owe, for instance, words like *hilt* and *outcome* to Carlyle *croon*, *eerie*, *gloaming* have become familiar to us from Burns's poems, and Sir Walter Scott added a large number of vivid local terms both to our written and our spoken language. In the great enrichment of the vocabulary of the romantic movement by means of words like *murk*, *gloaming* *glamour*, *gruesome*, *eerie*, *eldritch*, *uncanny*, *warlock*, *wraith*—all of which were dialect or local words, we find a good example of the expressive power of dialect speech, and see how a standard language can be enriched by the use of popular sources. All members of our Society can help this process by collecting words from popular speech which are in their opinion worthy of a larger currency; they can use them themselves and call the attention of their friends to them, and if they are writers, they may be able, like the writers of the past, to give them a literary standing. If their suggestions are not accepted, no harm is done; while, if they make a happy hit and bring to public notice a popular term or idiom which the language needs and accepts, they have performed a service to our speech of no small importance.

L. P. S.

NOTES TO THE ABOVE

Rôle. The italics and accent may be due to consciousness of *roll*. The French word will never make itself comfortable in English if it is homophonous with *roll*.

Timbre. This word is in a peculiar condition. In the French it has very various significations, but has come to be adopted in music and acoustics to connote the quality

of a musical sound independent of its pitch and loudness, a quality derived from the harmonics which the fundamental note intensifies, and that depends on the special form of the instrument. The article *Clang* in the Oxford Dictionary quotes Professor Tyndall regretting that we have no word for this meaning, and suggesting that we should imitate the awkward German *klang-farbe*. We have no word unless we forcibly deprive *clangour* of its noisy associations. We generally use *timbre* in italics and pronounce it as French; and since the word is used only by musicians this does not cause much inconvenience to them, but it is because of its being an unenglish word that it is confined to specialists: and truly if it were an English word the quality which it denotes would be spoken of more frequently, and perhaps be even more differentiated and recognized, though it is well known to every child. Now how should this word be Englished? Is the spelling or the pronunciation to stand? The English pronunciation of the letters of *timbre* is forbidden by its homophone—a French girl collecting postage-stamps in England explained that she collected *timberposts*—, whereas our English form of the French sound of the word would be approximately *tamber*: and this would be not only a good English-sounding word like *amber* and *clamber*, but would be like our *tambour*, which is *tympanum*, which again is *timbre*. So that if our professors and doctors of music were brave, they would speak and write *tamber*, which would be not only English but perfectly correct etymologically.

But this is just where what is called 'the rub' comes in. It would, for a month or two, look so peculiar a word that it might require something like a *coup d'état* to introduce it. And yet the schools of music in London could work the miracle without difficulty or delay.

Swine. Americans still use the word *pig* in its original sense of the young of the hog and sow; though they will say *chickens* for *poultry*. In England we talk of pigs and chickens when we mean swine and poultry. Chaucer has

His swyn his hors his stoor and his pultreye.

The verb *to pig* has kept to its meaning, though it has developed another: the substantive probably got loose through its generic employment in composite words, e.g. guinea-pig, sea-pig, &c.; and having acquired a generic use cannot lose it again. But it might perhaps be worth

while to distinguish strictly between the generic and the special use of the word *pig*, and not call a sow a pig, nor a hen a chicken. So *hog* and *sow* might still have their *pigs* and be all of them *swine*.

Swift. Perhaps it is going too far to say that 'swift' is colloquial only in metaphorical applications, we might speak of 'a swift bowler' without exciting surprise; but it is expedient to restore this word to general use, and avoid the use of *fast* for denotation of speed. 'To stand fast' is very well, but 'to run fast' is thoroughly objectionable. Such a use destroys the sense of firmness which the word is needed and well qualified to denote.

Chide. This word probably needs its past tense and participle to be securely fixed before it will be used. It is perhaps wholly the uncertainty of these that has made the word to be avoided. *Chid* and *chidden* should be taught, and *chode* and *chided* condemned as illiterate.

NOTE ON 'DYING WORDS', p. 7

Diderot in his *Lettre sur les Sourds et Muets* deplores the loss of good old terms in the French of his day; he writes:

'Je blâme cette noblesse prétendue qui nous a fait exclure de notre langue un grand nombre d'expressions énergiques. Les Grecs, les Latins qui ne connoissoient gueres cette fausse délicatesse, disoient en leur langue ce qu'ils vouloient, et comme ils le vouloient. Pour nous, à force de rafiner, nous avons appauvri la nôtre, & n'ayant souvent qu'un terme propre à rendre une idée, nous aimons mieux affoiblir l'idée que de ne pas employer un terme noble.¹ Quelle perte pour ceux d'entre nos Écrivains qui ont l'imagination forte, que celle de tant de mots que nous revoyons avec plaisir dans Amyot & dans Montaigne. Ils ont commencé par être rejettés du beau style, parce qu'ils avoient passé dans le peuple; & ensuite rebutés par le peuple même, qui à la longue est toujours le singe des Grands, ils sont devenus tout-à-fait inusités.' . . . [ED.]

¹ *Noble*. *Genteel* would not be a fair translation, but it gives the meaning. Litré quotes: 'Il ne nommera pas le boulanger de Cresus, le palefrenier de Cyrus, le chaudronnier Macistos; il dit grand panetier, écuyer, armurier, avertissant en note que cela est plus noble.'

CO-OPERATION OF MEMBERS

The method by which this Society proposes to work is to collect expert opinion on matters wherein our present use is indeterminate or unsatisfactory, and thus to arrive at a general understanding and consensus of opinion which might be relied on to influence practice.

This method implies the active co-operation of the members of the Society, who, it is presumed, are all interested in our aims; and the purpose of our secretary's paper (printed above) is to suggest topics on which members might usefully contribute facts and opinions.

The committee, who have added a few notes to the paper, offer some remarks on the topics suggested.

1. Whether it is advisable to Anglicize the spelling of certain French words, like *timbre*, in order to promote their assimilation. A paper dealing with this question, giving as full a list as possible of the words that are at present in a precarious condition, and proposing in each case the curative spelling, is invited; and any single practical contribution to the subject will be welcome.

2. A full list of foreign nouns that are uncertain of their Englished plurals is required. The unreadiness to come to a decided opinion in doubtful cases is due to the absence of any overruling principle; and the lack of a general principle is due to ignorance of all the particulars which it would affect. Inconsistent practice is no doubt in many cases established irrevocably, and yet if all the words about which there is at present any uncomfortable feeling were collected and exhibited, it would then probably appear that the majority of instances indicated a general rule of propriety and convenience, and this would immediately decide all doubtful cases, and these, when once recognized and established in educated practice, would win over many other words that are refractory in the absence of rule. What exceptions remained would be tabulated as definitely recognized exceptions.

3. Besides the class of words indicated in Mr. Pearsall Smith's paper, there is another set of plural forms needing attention, and that is the Greek words that denote the

various sciences and arts ; there is in these an uncertainty and inconsistency in the use of singular and plural forms. We say Music and Physics, but should we say Ethic or Ethics, Esthetic or Esthetics ? Here again agreement on a general rule to govern doubtful cases would be a boon. The experience of writers and teachers who are in daily contact with such words should make their opinions of value, and we invite them to deal with the subject. The corresponding use of Latin plurals taking singular verbs, as *Morals*, should be brought under rule.

4. The question of the use of *ae* (æ) and *oe* (œ). Our Society from the first abjured the whole controversy about reforms of spelling, but questions of literary propriety and convenience must sometimes involve the spellings ; and this is an instance of it. On the main question of phonetic spelling the Society would urge its members to distinguish the use of phonetic script in *teaching*, from its introduction into English *literature*. The first is absolutely desirable and inevitable : the second is not only undesirable but impracticable, though this would not preclude a good deal of reasonable reform in our literary spelling in a phonetic direction. Those who fear that if phonetics is taught in the schools it will then follow that our books will be commonly printed in phonetic symbols, should read Dr. Henry Bradley's lecture to the British Academy 'On the relations between spoken and written language' (1913), and they will see that the Society's Tract II, on 'English Homophones', illustrates the unpractical nature of any scheme either of pure phonetics in the printing of English books, or even of such a scheme as is offered by 'the Simplified Spelling Society'; because the great number of homophones which are now distinguished by their different spellings would make such a phonetic writing as unutilitarian as our present system is : moreover, if it were adopted it would inevitably lead to the elimination of far more of these homophones than we can afford to lose ; since it would enjoin by its spelling the law which now operates only by speech that homophones are self-destructive.

5. Mr. Pearsall Smith has returned to the question of dialectal regeneration mentioned in Tract I, in which we invited contributions on the subject. In response we had a paper sent to us, which we do not print because, though full of learning and interesting detail, it was a curious and general disquisition calculated to divert attention from

the practical points. What the Society asks for is not a list of lost words that are interesting in themselves: we need rather definite instances of good dialect words which are not homophones and which would conveniently supply wants. That is, any word proposed for rehabilitation in our practical vocabulary should be not only a good word in itself, but should fall into some definite place and relieve and enrich our speech by its usefulness. It is evident that no one person can be expected to supply a full list of such words, but on the other hand there must be very many of our members who could contribute one or two; and such contributions are invited.

Exempli gratia. Here are two words with very different titles and claims, *nesh* and *hyppish*.

Nesh, which has two columns in the Oxford Dictionary, begins in A.D. 888, and is still heartily alive in Yorks. and North Derbyshire, where it is used in the sense of being *oversensitive to pain and especially to cold*. In this special signification, to which it has locally settled down after a thousand years of experience, it has no rival; and its restoration to our domestic vocabulary would probably have a wholesome moral and physical effect on our children.

Hyppish is the Englished form of hypochondriacal, its suffix carrying its usual diminutive value, so that its meaning is 'somewhat hypochondriacal'. Berkeley, Gray, and Swift used *hyp* or *the hyp* for hypochondriasis, and the adjective was apparently common. It would seem that *hypochondria* was then spoken, as *hypocrisy* still is, with the correct and pleasant short vowels of the Greek prefix, not as now with a long alien diphthong *haipo-*. It was presumably this short y that accidentally killed *hyppish*; for the word *hipped* was used of a horse lamed in the hip, and alongside of this *hipped*, and maybe attracted by it, an adjective *hypt* arose. When once *hyp* and *hypt* were confounded with *hip* and *hipped*, *hyppish* would suffer and lose definition. But *hypt* and *hipped* combined forces, and were probably even from the first in their present uncertain condition, for when nowadays a man says that he is *hipped*, he has no definite notion of what he means except that he is in some way, either in his loins or mind incapacitated and out of sorts. Whether *hypt* and *hipped* have mortally wounded each other or are still fighting in the dark may be open to discussion: *hyppish* has now a fair field, and if

people would know what the word means, it might be restored, like *nesh*, to useful domestic activity.

6. The example given of the word *fast* on p. 12 suggests another matter to which attention might be paid. If one looks up any word in the Oxford Dictionary, one will be almost distressed to see how various the significations are to which it is authoritatively susceptible. A word seems to behave like an animal that goes skirting about discontentedly, in search of a more congenial habitation. It is sometimes successful, and meets with surprising welcome in some strange corner where it establishes itself, forgetful of its old home: sometimes, like the bad spirit in the gospel, it will return to the house whence it came forth. It is, of course, natural and essential to a living language that such shades and varieties of meaning should evolve themselves, although they are incidentally a source of ambiguity and subtle traps for careless logic; but when these varieties so diverge as to arrive ultimately at absurdities and contradictions, then it is advisable to get rid of them. In such extreme cases the surgeon's knife may sometimes save life; it is the only cure; and *to use a word in a deforming or deformed sense should be condemned as a solecism*. Contributions, stating examples of this with the proposed taboo, are invited.

7. This last fault, of damaging a word by wrong use, might come under the general head of 'Abuse of words'. This is a wide and popular topic, as may be seen by the constant small rain of private protests in the correspondence columns of the newspapers. The committee of the S.P.E. would be glad to meet the public taste by expert treatment of offending words if members would supply their pet abominations. There was a good letter on the use of *morale* in the *Times Literary Supplement* on February 19. The writer, a member of our Society, permits us to reprint it here as a sample of sound treatment.

"MORAL(E)

'Tis the sport to have the engineer hoist with his own petard, and the purizing (so to speak) of the purist has been a tempting game since Lucian baited Lexiphanes;

may I yield to the temptation? During the war our amateur and other strategists have suppressed the English word *morale* and combined to force upon us in its stead the French (or Franco-German?) *moral*. We have submitted, as to Dora, but with the secret hope, as about Dora, that when the war's tyranny was overpast we might be allowed our liberty again. Here are two specimens, from your own columns, of the disciplinary measures to which we have been subject: 'He persistently spells *moral* (state of mind of the troops, not their morality) with a final *e*, a sign of ignorance of French which is unfortunately so often the mark of the classical scholar'; and again, 'The purist in language might quarrel with Mr. ——'s title for this book on the psychology of war, for he means by *morale* not "ethics" or "moral philosophy", but "the temper of a people expressing itself in action". But no doubt there is authority for the perversion of the French word.'

To such discipline we have all been laudably amenable, and *morale* has seldom been seen in the London papers since 1914; but it, and not *moral*, is the English word; we once all wrote it without thinking twice about the matter; even in war-time one met it in the local newspapers that had not time to keep up with London's latest tricks, and in those parts of the London Press itself that had to use a tongue understood of the people. It is very refreshing to see that *morale* is now beginning to show itself again, timidly and occasionally, even in select quarters. The fact is, these literary drill-sergeants have made a mistake; the English *morale* is not a 'perversion of the French word'; it is a phonetic respelling, and a most useful one, of a French word. We have never had anything to do with the French word *morale* (ethics, morality, a moral, &c.); but we found the French word *moral* (state of discipline and spirit in armies, &c.) suited to our needs, and put an *e* on to it to keep its sound distinct from that of our own word *moral*, just as we have done with the French *local* (English *locale*) and the German *Choral* (English *chorale*), and as, using contrary means for the same end of fixing a sound, we have turned French *diplomate* into English *diplomat*. Our English *forte* ('Geniality is not his *forte*', &c.) is altered from the French *fort* without even the advantage of either keeping the French sound or distinguishing the spoken word from our *fort*; but who proposes to sacrifice the reader's convenience by correcting

the 'ignorant' spelling? In the light of these parallels is it not the patrons of *moral* who deserve the imputation of ignorance rather than we common folk? We do not indeed profess to know what *moral* and *morale* mean in French, but then that knowledge is irrelevant. They do not know the true English method of dealing with borrowings from French; and that knowledge is highly relevant.

A fair summary of the matter is perhaps this. The case for the spelling *moral* is that (1) the French use the word *moral* for what we used to call *morale*, and therefore we ought to do the same; and (2) the French use *morale* to mean something different from what we mean by it. The case against *moral* is (1) that it is a new word, less comprehensible to ordinary people, even now, after its war-time currency, than the old *morale*; (2) that it badly needs to be dressed in italics owing to the occasional danger of confusion with the English word *moral* and that such artificial precautions are never kept up; (3) that half of us do not know whether to call it *mō'ral*, *morā'l*, or *morah'l*, and that it is a recognized English custom to resolve such doubts by the addition of *-e* or other change of spelling. And the right choice is surely to make the English word *morale* use ordinary type, call it *morah'l*, and ignore or abstain from the French word *morale*, of which we have no need.

The risk of confusion, merely mentioned above, perhaps deserves a paragraph to itself. If we reinstate the once almost universal *morale*, we need no italics, and there is no fear of confusion; if we adopt *moral*, we need italics, and there is no hope of getting them; it is at present printed oftener without than with them. The following five extracts, in some of which the English adjective *moral*, and in some the French noun *moral*, is meant, are printed here exactly as they originally appeared, that is, with *moral* in the same type as the rest, and they are enough to suggest how easy it is for real doubts to arise about which word is being used—'An astounding increase in the moral discipline and patriotism of German soldiers.' Has, or has not, a comma dropped out after *moral*? 'It is, indeed, a new proof of the failing moral and internal troubles of the German people.' Moral and internal? or moral and troubles? 'A true arbitrator, a man really impartial between two contestants and even indifferent to their

opposing morals.' 'The Russian army will recover its moral and fighting power.' 'The need of Poland, not only for moral, but for the material support of the Allies.'

H. W. FOWLER."

'SPELLING PRONUNCIATIONS'

Many writers on English pronunciation are accustomed to pour undiscriminating censure on the growing practice of substituting for the traditional mode of pronouncing certain words an 'artificial' pronunciation which is an interpretation of the written form of the words in accordance with the general rules relating to the 'powers' of the letters. This practice is especially common among imperfectly educated people who are ambitious of speaking correctly, and have unfortunately no better standard of 'correctness' than that of conformity with the spelling. I remember hearing a highly-intelligent working-class orator repeatedly pronounce the word *suggest* as 'sug jest'. Such vagaries as this are not likely ever to be generally adopted. But a good many 'spelling-pronunciations' have found their way into general educated use, and others which are now condemned as vulgar or affected will probably at some future time be universally adopted. I do not share the sentimental regret with which some philologists regard this tendency of the language. It seems to me that each case ought to be judged on its own merits, and by a strictly utilitarian standard. When a 'spelling-pronunciation' is a mere useless pedantry, it is well that we should resist it as long as we can; if it gets itself accepted, we must acquiesce, and unless the change is not only useless but harmful, we should do so without regret, because the influence of the written on the spoken form of language is in itself no more condemnable than any other of the natural processes that affect the development of speech. There are, however, some 'spelling-pronunciations' that are positively mischievous. Many people, though hardly among those who are commonly reckoned good speakers, pronounce *forehead* as it is written. To do so is irrelevantly to call attention to the etymology of a word that has no longer precisely its etymological sense. When the thing to be denoted is familiar, we require an *identifying*, not a *descriptive* word for it; and we obey a sound instinct in disguising by a contracted pronunciation the disturbing fact that *forehead* is a compound.

On the other hand, a 'spelling-pronunciation' may conduce to clearness, and then it ought to be encouraged. I have elsewhere advocated the sounding of the initial *p* in learned (not in popular) words beginning with *ps*. and many other similar reforms might with advantage be adopted. There are also other reasons besides clearness which sometimes justify the assimilation of sound to spelling. Thus the modern pronunciation of *cucumber* (instead of 'cowcumber') gets rid of the ridiculous association with the word *cow*; and only a fanatical adherent of the principle 'Whatever was is right' would desire to revive the obsolete form.

H. B.

REPORT

The Hon. Secretary having gone away on a mission to Armenia, there has been some slight unpunctuality in our replies to correspondents, but all letters have been answered, and all donations and subscriptions acknowledged. As he cannot be expected in England before May, it will be convenient that cheques should at present not be drawn to his name, but to *The Treasurer of the S.P.E.*, and crossed *Barclay's Bank, Oxford*, where the Society's account stands. Letters addressed to Mr. Pearsall Smith are regularly transmitted to *Mr. Robert Bridges, Chilswell, near Oxford*, who is acting as both Treasurer and Secretary until our Secretary shall happily return to his duties. Many new members have joined, but the list of their names and statement of accounts are deferred until the Hon. Secretary's return.

The Committee are grateful for the sympathy and encouragement of the public, but have been so far disappointed at not receiving more contributions of work, and promised papers have not come to hand. From their knowledge of individual cases they can attribute this silence to the peculiar confusion of the times, by which they are themselves affected. They have confidence that their expectations will in due course be fulfilled, and that meanwhile these lamentable days of distraction can be bridged over: but they would urge members who have any special knowledge or interest to put their experience and suggestions or resolutions on paper for the benefit of the 'Tracts'. *Such contributions from overseas are especially invited.*

On the cover of the Tracts, under their own advertisements, the Committee will give titles of books recommended as congenial and useful to the Society's aims.

The Tracts should be obtained overseas from the local branches of the Oxford University Press, as given on p. 2 of cover.

OXFORD, *March, 1920.*

S. P. E.

TRACT No. IV

THE PRONUNCIATION OF
ENGLISH WORDS DERIVED
FROM THE LATIN

By

John Sargeaunt

With Preface and Notes by H. Bradley

CORRESPONDENCE & MISCELLANEOUS NOTES
BY H. B., R. B., H. W. F., AND EDITORIAL



At the Clarendon Press

M DCCCC XXIV

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Amen Corner *London EC 4*
29-35 West 32nd Street *New York*
Cathedral Buildings *Melbourne*
100 Princes Street *Edinburgh*
104 West George Street *Glasgow*
25-27 Richmond Street West *Toronto*
17-19 Elphinstone Circle *Bombay*
Anjuman Building, Mount Road *Madras*
1 Garstin Place *Calcutta*
Markham's Buildings, Adderley Street *Cape Town*
C 445 Honan Road *Shanghai*

HUMPHREY MILFORD *Publisher to the University*

ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF ENGLISH WORDS DERIVED FROM LATIN

[THIS paper may perhaps need a few words of introduction concerning the history of the pronunciation of Latin in England.

The Latin taught by Pope Gregory's missionaries to their English converts at the beginning of the seventh century was a living language. Its pronunciation, in the mouths of educated people when they spoke carefully, was still practically what it had been in the first century, with the following important exceptions. 1. The consonantal *u* was sounded like the *v* of modern English 2. The *c* before front vowels (*e, i, o, æ, œ*), and the combinations *tt, ct* before vowels, were pronounced *ts*. 3. The *g* before front vowels had a sound closely resembling that of the Latin consonantal *z*. 4. The *s* between vowels was pronounced like our *z*. 5. The combinations *ae, oe* were no longer pronounced as diphthongs, but like the simple *e*. 6. The ancient vowel-quantities were preserved only in the penultima of polysyllables (where they determined the stress); in all other positions the original system of quantities had given place to a new system based mainly on rhythm. Of this system in detail we have little certain knowledge; but one of its features was that the vowel which ended the first syllable of a disyllable was always long: *pāter, pātrem, Dēus, pius, iter, ōvis, hūmus*.

Even so early as the beginning of the fifth century, St. Augustine tells us that the vowel-quantities, which it was necessary to learn in order to write verse correctly, were not observed in speech. The Latin-speaking schoolboy had to learn them in much the same fashion as did the English schoolboy of the nineteenth century.

It is interesting to observe that, while the English scholars of the tenth century pronounced their Latin in the manner which their ancestors had learned from the continental missionaries, the tradition of the ancient vowel-quantities

still survived (to some extent at least) among their British neighbours, whose knowledge of Latin was an inheritance from the days of Roman rule. On this point the following passage from the preface to *Ælfric's Latin Grammar* (written for English schoolboys about A.D. 1000) is instructive :—

Miror ualde quare multi corripiunt sillabas in prosa quae in metro breues sunt, cum prosa absoluta sit a lege metri; sicut pronuntiant *pater* brittonice et *malus* et similia, quae in meto habentur breues. Mihi tamen uidetur melius inuocare Deum Patrem honorifice producta sillaba quam brittonice corripere, quia nec Deus ait grammaticae subiciendus est.

The British contagion of which *Ælfric* here complains had no permanent effect. For after the Norman Conquest English boys learned their Latin from teachers whose ordinary language was French. For a time, they were not usually taught to write or read English, but only French and Latin; so that the Englishmen who attempted to write their native language did so in a phonetic orthography on a French basis. The higher classes in England, all through the thirteenth century, had two native languages, English and French.

In the grammar schools, the Latin lessons were given in French; it was not till the middle of the fourteenth century that a bold educational reformer, John Cornwall, could venture to make English the vehicle of instruction. In reading Latin, the rhythmically-determined vowel-quantities of post-classical times were used; and the Roman letters were pronounced, first as they were in French, and afterwards as in English, but in the fourteenth century this made little difference.

In Chaucer's time, the other nations of Europe, no less than England, pronounced Latin after the fashion of their own vernaculars. When, subsequently, the phonetic values of the letters in the vernacular gradually changed, the Latin pronunciation altered likewise. Hence, in the end, the pronunciation of Latin has become different in different countries. A scholar born in Italy has great difficulty in following a Frenchman speaking Latin. He has greater difficulty in understanding an Englishman's Latin, because in English the changes in the sounds of the letters have been greater than in any other language. Every vowel-letter has several sounds, and the normal long sound of every

vowel-letter has no resemblance whatever to its normal short sound. As in England the pronunciation of Latin developed insensibly along with that of the native tongue, it eventually became so peculiar that by comparison the 'continental pronunciation' may be regarded as uniform.

It is sometimes imagined that the modern English way of pronouncing Latin was a deliberate invention of the Protestant reformers. For this view there is no foundation in fact. It may be conceded that English ecclesiastics and scholars who had frequent occasion to converse in Latin with Italians would learn to pronounce it in the Italian way; and no doubt the Reformation must have operated to arrest the growing tendency to the Italianization of English Latin. But there is no evidence that before the Reformation the un-English pronunciation was taught in the schools. The grammar-school pronunciation of the early nineteenth century was the lineal descendant of the grammar-school pronunciation of the fourteenth century.

This traditional system of pronunciation is now rapidly becoming obsolete, and for very good reasons. But it is the basis of the pronunciation of the many classical derivatives in English; and therefore it is highly important that we should understand precisely what it was before it began to be sophisticated (as in our own early days) by sporadic and inconsistent attempts to restore the classical quantities. In the following paper Mr. Saigeaunt describes, with a minuteness not before attempted, the genuine English tradition of Latin pronunciation, and points out its significance as a factor in the development of modern English.

H. B.]

IT seems not to be generally known that there is a real principle in the English pronunciation of words borrowed from Latin and Greek, whether directly or through French. In this matter the very knowledge of classical Latin, of its stresses and its quantities, still more perhaps an acquaintance with Greek, is apt to mislead. Some speakers seem to think that their scholarship will be doubted unless they say 'doctrinal' and 'scriptural' and 'cinéma'. The object of this paper is to show by setting forth the principles consciously or unconsciously followed by our ancestors that such pronunciations are as erroneous as in the case of the ordinary man they are unnatural and pedantic. An exception for

which there is a reason must of course be accepted, but an exception for which reason is unsound is on every ground to be deprecated. Among other motives for preserving the traditional pronunciation must be reckoned the claim of poetry. Mark Pattison notes how a passage of Pope which deals with the Barrier Treaty loses much of its effect because we no longer stress the second syllable of 'barrier'. Pope's word is gone beyond recovery, but others which are threatened by false theories may yet be preserved.

The *New English Dictionary*, whose business it is to record facts, shows that in not a few common words there is at present much confusion and uncertainty concerning the right pronunciation. This applies mostly to the position of the stress or, as some prefer to call it, the accent, but in many cases it is true also of the quantity of the vowels. It is desirable to show that there is a principle in this matter, rules which have been naturally and unconsciously obeyed, because they harmonize with the genius of the English tongue.

For nearly three centuries from the Reformation to the Victorian era there was in this country a uniform pronunciation of Latin. It had its own definite principles, involving in some cases a disregard of the classical quantities though not of the classical stress or accent. It survives in borrowed words such as *āliās* and *stāmina*, in naturalized legal phrases, such as *Nisi Prius* and *ōnus probandi*, and with some few changes in the Westminster Play. This pronunciation is now out of fashion, but, since its supersession does not justify a change in the pronunciation of words which have become part of our language, it will be well to begin with a formulation of its rules.

The rule of Latin stress was observed as it obtained in the time of Quintilian. In the earliest Latin the usage had been other, the stress coming as early in the word as was possible. Down to the days of Terence and probably somewhat later the old rule still held good of quadrисyllables with the scansion of *mūlīerīs* or *mūlīerēs*, but in other words had given way to the later Quintilian rule, that all words with a long unit as penultimate had the stress on the vowel in that unit, while words of more than two syllables with a short penultimate had the stress on the antepenultimate. I say 'unit' because here, as in scansion, what counts is not the syllable, but the vowel plus all the consonants that come between it and the next vowel. Thus *infērnus*, where the

penultimate vowel is short, no less than *suprēmus*, where it is long, has the stress on the penultima. In *volucris*, where the penultimate unit was short, as it was in prose and could be in verse, the stress was on the *o*, but when *ucr* made a long unit the stress comes on the *u*, though of course the vowel remains short. In polysyllables there was a secondary stress on the alternate vowels. Ignorance of this usage has made a present-day critic falsely accuse Shakespeare of a false quantity in the line

Coriolanus in Corfoli.

It may be safely said that from the Reformation to the nineteenth century no Englishman pronounced the last word otherwise than I have written it. The author of the 'Pronouncing Dictionary attached to the 'Dictionary of Gardening' unfortunately instructs us to say *gládiolus* on the ground that the *i* is short. The ground alleged, though true, is irrelevant, and, although Terence would have pronounced it *gládiolus*, Quintilian, like Cicero, would have said *gladio-lus*. Mr. Myles quotes Pliny for the word, but Pliny would no more have thought of saying *gládiolus* than we should now think of saying 'labour' except when we are reading Chaucer.

We need not here discuss the dubious exceptions to this rule, such as words with an enclitic attached, e.g. *primāque* in which some authorities put the stress on the vowel which precedes the enclitic, or such clift words as 'illuc', where the stress may at one time have fallen on the last vowel. In any case no English word is concerned.

In very long words the due alternation of stressed and unstressed vowels was not easy to maintain. There was no difficulty in such a combination as *honorificábilis* or as *tudinitatibús*, but with the halves put together there would be a tendency to say *honorificabilitudinitatibus*. Thus there ought not to be much difficulty in saying *Constantíno-pólitáni*, whether you keep the long antepenultima or shorten it after the English way; but he who forced the reluctant word to end an hexameter must have had 'Constantinóple' in his mind, and therefore said *Constántinópolitáni* with two false stresses. The result was an illicit lengthening of the second *o*. His other false quantity, the shortening of the second *i*, was due to the English pronunciation, the influence of such words as 'metropolitan', and, as old schoolmasters used to put it, a neglect of the

Gradus. Even when the stress falls on this antepenultimate *i*, it is short in English speech. Doubtless Milton shortened it in 'Areopagitica', just as English usage made him lengthen the initial vowel of the word.

Probably very few of the Englishmen who used the traditional pronunciation of Latin knew that they gave many different sounds to each of the symbols or letters. Words which have been transported bodily into English will provide examples under each head. It will be understood that in the traditional pronunciation of Latin these words were spoken exactly as they are spoken in the English of the present day. For the sake of simplicity it may be allowed us to ignore some distinctions rightly made by phoneticians. Thus the long initial vowel of *alias* is not really the same as the long initial vowel of *area*, but the two will be treated as identical. It will thus be possible to write of only three kinds of vowels, long, short, and obscure.

The letter or symbol *a* stood for two long sounds, heard in the first syllables of *alias* and of *larva*, for the short sound heard in the first syllable of *stamina*, and for the obscure sound heard in the last syllable of each of these last two words in English.

The letter *e* stood for the long sounds heard in *genus* and in *verbum*, for the short sound heard in *item*, and for the obscure sound heard in *cancer*. When it ended a word it had, if short, the sound of a short *i*, as in *pro lege*, *rege*, *grege*, as also in unstressed syllables in such words as *precentor* and *regalia*.

The letter *i* stood for the two long sounds heard in *minor* and in *circus* and for the short sound heard in *premium* and *incubus*.

The letter *o* stood for the two long sounds heard in *odium* and in *corpus*, for the short sound in *scrofula*, and for the obscure in *extempore*.

The two long sounds of *u* are heard in *rumor*, if that spelling may be allowed, and in the middle syllable of *laburnum*, the two short sounds in the first *u* of *incubus* and in the first *u* of *lustrum*, the obscure sound in the final syllables of these two words. Further the long sound was preceded except after *l* and *r* by a parasitic *y* as in *albumen* and *incubus*. This parasitic *y* is perhaps not of very long standing. In some old families the tradition still compels such pronunciations as *moosic*.

The diphthongs *æ* and *ə* were merely *e*, while *au* and *eu*

were sounded as in our *August* and *Euxine*. The two latter diphthongs stood alone in never being shortened even when they were unstressed and followed by two consonants. Thus men said *Eustolia* and *Augustus*, while they said *Æschylus* and *Œdipus*. Dryden and many others usually wrote the *Æ* as *E*. Thus Garrick in a letter commends an adaptation of 'Eschylus', and although Boswell reports him as asking Harris 'Pray, Sir, have you read Potter's *Æschylus*?' both the speaker and the reporter called the name *Eschylus*.

The letter *y* was treated as *i*.

The consonants were pronounced as in English words derived from Latin. Thus *c* before *e*, *i*, *y*, *æ*, and *œ* was *s*, as in *census*, *circus*, *Cyrus*, *Cæsar*, and *cœlestial*, a spelling not classical and now out of use. Elsewhere *c* was *k*. Before the same vowels *g* was *j* (dʒ), as in *genus*, *gibbus*, *gyrus*. The sibilant was voiced or voiceless as in English words, the one in *rosaceus*, the other in *saliva*.

It will be seen that the Latin sounds were throughout frankly Anglicized. According to Burney a like principle was followed by Burke when he read French poetry aloud. He read it as though it were English. Thus on his lips the French word *comment* was pronounced as the English word *comment*.

The rule that overrode all others, though it has the exceptions given below, was that vowels and any other diphthongs than *au* and *eu*, if they were followed by two consonants, were pronounced short. Thus *a* in *magnus*, though long in classical Latin, was pronounced as in our 'magnitude', and *e* in *census*, in Greek transcription represented by *η*, was pronounced short, as it is when borrowed into English. So were the penultimate vowels in *villa*, *nullus*, *cæspes*.

This rule of shortening the vowel before two consonants held good even when in fact only one was pronounced, as in *nullus* and other words where a double consonant was written and in Italian pronounced.

Moreover, the parasitic *y* was treated as a consonant, hence our 'vacuum'.

In the penultima *qu* was treated as a single consonant, so that the vowel was pronounced long in *āquam*, *ēquam*, *īnīquam*, *lōquor*. So it was after *o*, hence our 'collōquial'; but in earlier syllables than the penultima *qu* was treated as a double consonant, hence our 'subāqueous', 'equity', 'iniquity'.

Exceptions.

1. When the former of the two consonants was *r* and the latter another consonant than *r*, as in the series represented by *larva*, *verbum*, *circus*, *corpus*, *laburnum*, the vowels are a separate class of long vowels, though not really recognized as such. Of course our ancestors and the *Gradus* marked them long because in verse the vowel with the two consonants makes a long unit.

2. A fully stressed vowel before a mute and *r*, or before *cl* or *pl*, was pronounced long in the penultima. Latin examples are *labrum*, *Hebrum*, *librum*, *probrum*, *rubrum*, *acrem*, *cedrum*, *vafrum*, *agrūm*, *pigrum*, *aprūm*, *veprem*, *patrem*, *citrūm*, *utrum*, *triplus*, *duplex*, *Cyclops*. Moreover, in other syllables than the penultima the vowel in the same combinations was pronounced long if the two following vowels had no consonant between them, as *patria*, *Hadria*, *acrius*. (Our 'triple' comes from *triplum* and is a duplicate of 'treble'. Perhaps the short vowel is due to its passage through French. Our 'citron' comes from *citronem*, in which *i* was short.)

3. The preposition and adverb *post* was pronounced with a long vowel both by itself and in composition with verbs, but its adjectives did not follow suit. Hence we say in English 'postpone', but 'posterior' and 'posthumous'.

Monosyllables ending in a vowel were pronounced long, those ending in a consonant short. Enclitics like *que* were no real exception as they formed part of the preceding word. There were, however, some real exceptions.

1. Pronouns ending in *-os*, as *hos*, *quos*. These followed *eos* and *illos*.

2. Words ending in *-es*, as *pes*, *res*.

3. Words ending in *r*, as *par*, *fer*, *vir*, *cor*, *fur*. These had that form of long vowel which we use in 'part', 'fertile', 'virtue', 'cordate', 'furtive'.

In disyllables the former vowel or diphthong, if followed by a single consonant, or by a mute and *r*, or by *cl* or *pl*, was pronounced long, a usage which according to Mr. Henry Bradley dates in spoken Latin from the fourth century. Examples are *apex*, *tenet*, *item*, *focus*, *pupa*, *Psyche*, *Cæsar*, *fætus*. I believe that at first the only exceptions were *tibi*, *sibi*, *ibi*, *quibus*, *tribus*. In later days the imperfect and future of *sum* became exceptions. Here perhaps the short vowel arose from the hideous and wholly erroneous habit, happily never universal though still in some vogue, of reciting

erám, erás, erát. There are actually schoolbooks which treat the verse *ictus*, the beat of the chanter's foot as a word stress and prescribe *terra tríbüs scopulís*. I can say of these books only *Percant ipsi, mutescant scriptores*, and do not mind using a post-classical word in order to say it.

In disyllables the former vowel or diphthong, if followed immediately by another vowel or diphthong, had the quality, and if emphatic also the quality, of a long vowel. The distinction was not recognized, and seems not to be generally acknowledged even now. We seem not to have borrowed many words which will illustrate this. We have however *fiat*, and *pius* was pronounced exactly as we pronounce 'pious', while for a diphthong we may quote Shelley,

Mid the mountains Euganean
I stood listening to the paean.

English derivatives will show the long quality of the vowels in *aer, deus, coit, duo*. To these add *Grains*.

The rule of *apex* applies also to words of more than two syllables with long penultima, as *gravamen, arena, saliva, abdomen, acumen*. The rule of *aer* also holds good though it hardly has other instances than Greek names, as *Machón, Aénæs, Thalía, Achelóus, Achéi*.

In words of more than two syllables with short penultima the vowel in the stressed antepenultima was pronounced short when there was a consonant between the two last vowels, and *i* and *y* were short even when no consonant stood in that place. Examples are *stamina, Sexagesima, minimum, modicum, tibia, Polybius*. But *u, au, eu* were, as usual, exceptions, as *tumulus, Aufidus, Eutychus*. I believe that originally men said *Cæsarem*, as they certainly said *cæspitem* and *Cætulum*, as also *Cæsarea*. but here in familiar words the cases came to follow the nominative.

Exceptions to the rule were verb forms which had *āv. ēv, īv, or ūv* in the antepenultima, as *anāveram, defleverat, audivero, moveras*, and like forms from aorists with the penultima long, as *suascram. egero, miserat, roseras*, and their compounds.

This rule was among the first to break down, and about the middle of the nineteenth century the Westminster Play began to observe the true quantities in the antepenultimate syllables. Thus in spite of 'consideration' boys said *sidera*. and in spite of 'nōminal' they said *nōmina*, while they still said *sōlitus* and *rāpidus*.

On the other hand the following rule, of which borrowed words provide many examples, still obtains in the Play. In words of more than two syllables any vowel in the antepenultima other than *i* or *y* was pronounced long if no consonant divided the two following vowels. Possibly the reason was that there was a synæresis of the two vowels, but I doubt this, for a parasitic *y* was treated as a consonant. Examples are *alias*, *genius*, *odium*, *junior*, *anæmia*, and on the other hand *filius*, *Lýdia*. Compound verbs with a short prefix were exceptions, as *þeo*, *rëcreo*, whence our 'recreant'. A long prefix remained long as in *dësino*. The only other exception that I can remember was *Phöloe*.

In polysyllables the general rule was that all vowels and diphthongs before the penultima other than *u*, when it bore a primary or secondary stress, and *au* and *eu* were pronounced short except where the 'alias' rule or the 'larva' rule applied. Thus we said *hërëditarius*, *æquabilitas*, *imbëcillus*, *suspiczonem*, but *fiduciarius*, *mëdiocritas* *pärticipare*. I do not know why the popular voice now gives *Ariadne*, for our forefathers said *Åriadne* as they said *årea*.

In very long words the alternation of stress and no-stress was insisted on. I remember a schoolmaster who took his degree at Oxford in the year 1827 reproving a boy for saying *Alphesibëus* instead of *Alphesibëus*, and I suspect that Wordsworth meant no inverted stress in

Laódamia, that at Jove's command—

nor Landor in

Aítémidóra, gods invisible—

though I hope that they did.

It is not to be thought that these rules were in any way arbitrary. So little was this so that, I believe, they were never even formulated. If examples with the quantities marked were ever given, they must have been for the use of foreigners settling in England. English boys did not want rules, and their teachers could not really have given them. The teachers did not understand that each vowel represented not two sounds only, a long and a short, but many more. This fact was no more understood by John Walker, the actor and lexicographer, who in 1798 published a Key to the Classical Pronunciation of Greek and Latin proper names. His general rule was wrong as a general rule, and so far as it agreed with facts it was useless. He says that

when a vowel ends a syllable it is long, and when it does not it is short. Apart from the confusion of cause and effect there is the error of identifying for instance the *e* in *beatus* and the *e* in *habebat*. Moreover, Walker confounds the *u* in 'curfew', really long, with the short and otherwise different *u* in 'but'. The rule was useless as a guide, for it did not say whether *moneo* for instance was to be read as *mo-neo* or as *mon-eo*, and therefore whether the *o* was to be long or short. Even Walker's list is no exact guide. He gives for instance *Mō-na*, which is right, and *Mō-nāses*, which is not. Now without going into the difference between long vowels and ordinary vowels, of which latter some are long in scansion and some short, it is clear that there is no identity. In fact *Mona* has the long *o* of 'moan' and *Monāses* the ordinary *o* of 'monaster'. A boy at school was not troubled by these matters. He had only two things to learn, first the quantity of the penultimate unit, second the fact that a final vowel was pronounced. When he knew these two things he gave the Latin word the sounds which it would have if it were an English word imported from the Latin. Thus he finds the word *civilitate*. I am not sure that he could find it, but that does not matter. He would know 'civility', and he learns that the penultima of the Latin word is long. Therefore he says *civilitātē*. Again he knows 'infinit' (I must be allowed to spell the word as it is pronounced except in corrupt quires). He finds that the penultima of *infinitivus* is long, and he therefore says *infinitīvūs*. Again he knows 'irradiate', and finding that the penultima of *irradiabitur* is short he says *irrādiābitūr*. It is true that some of these verb forms under the influence of their congeners came to have an exceptional pronunciation. Thus *irradiabit* led at last to *irradiabitur*, but I doubt whether this occurred before the nineteenth century. The word *dabitur*, almost naturalized by Luther's adage of *date et dabitur*, kept its short *a* down to the time when it regained it, in a slightly different form, by its Roman right; and *amāmini* and *monēmini* were unwavering in their use. Old people said *vāriābilis* long after the true quantities had asserted themselves, and the word as the specific name of a plant may be heard even now. Its first syllable of course follows what I shall call the 'alias' rule. We may still see this rule in other instances. All men say 'hippopótamus', and even those who know that this *a* is short in Greek can say nothing but 'Mesopotāmia', unless indeed the word

lose its blessed and comforting powers in a disyllabic abbreviation. When a country was named after Cecil Rhodes, where the *e* in the surname is mute, we all called it 'Rhodesia'. Had it been named after a Newman, where the *a* is short or rather obscure, we should all have called it 'Newmānia', while, named after a Davis, it would certainly have been 'Davisia'. The process of thought would in each case have been unconscious. A new example is 'aviation', whose first vowel has been instinctively lengthened.

Again, when the word 'telegram' was coined, some scholars objected to its formation and insisted upon 'telegrapheme', but the most obdurate Grecian did not propose to keep the long Greek vowel in the first syllable. When only the other day 'cinematograph' made its not wholly desirable appearance, it made no claim to a long vowel in either of its two first syllables. Not till it was reasonably shortened into 'cinēma' did a Judge from the Bench make a lawless decree for a long second vowel, and even he left the *i* short though it is long in Greek.

Of course with the manner of speech the quantities had to be learnt separately. The task was not as difficult as some may think. To boys with a taste for making verses the thumbing of a Gradus (I hope that no one calls it a Grādus) was always a delightful occupation, and a quantity once learnt was seldom forgotten. It must be admitted that, as boys were forced to do verses, whether they could or not, there were always some who could read and yet forget.

Although these usages did not precede but followed the pronunciation of words already borrowed from Latin, we may use them to classify the changes of quantity. We shall see that although there are some exceptions for which it is difficult to give a reason, yet most of the exceptions fall under two classes. When words came to us through French, the pronunciation was often affected by the French form of the word. Thus the adjective 'present' would, if it had come direct from Latin, have had a long vowel in the first syllable. To an English ear 'présent' seemed nearer than 'present' to the French 'présent'. The *N.E.D.* says that 'gladiator' comes straight from the Latin 'gladiatorem'. Surely in that case it would have had its first vowel long, as in 'radiator' and 'mediator'. In any case its pronunciation must have been affected by 'gladiateur'. The other class of exceptions consists of words deliberately introduced

by writers at a late period. Thus 'adorable' began as a penman's word. Following 'inexorable' and the like it should have been 'adorable'. Actually it was formed by adding *-able* to 'adore', like 'laughable'. It is now too stiff in the joints to think of a change, and must continue to figure with the other sins of the Restoration.

Before dealing with the words as classified by their formation, we may make short lists of typical words to show that for the pronunciation of English derivatives it is idle to refer to the classical quantities.

From *æ*: ēdifice, ēmulate, cērulean, quēstion.

From *ā*: ēconomy, ēcumenical, confēderate.

From *ā*: donātive, nātural, clāmour, āverse.

From *ă*: ālien, stātion, stāble, āmiable.

From *ē*: ēvident, Quadragēsima, plēnitude, sēgregate.

From *ĕ*: sēries, sēnile, gēnus, gēnius.

From *ī*: lascīvious, eradicate, dividend, filial, suspīcion.

From *ī*: libel, mītre, sīlex.

From *ō*: ō:iator, prōminent, prōmontōry. sōlitude.

From *ō*: bōvine lōcal, fōrum, collōquial.

From *ū*: figūrative, scriptūral, solūble.

From *ū*: nūmerous, Cūpīd, allūvial, cerūlean.

The *N.E.D.* prefers the spelling 'cēcumenical'; but Newman wrote naturally 'ecumenical', and so does Dr. J. B. Bury. Dublin scholarship has in this matter been markedly correct.

Classification of words according to their Latin stems.

In classification it seems simplest to take the words according to their Latin stems. We must however, first deal with a class of adjectives borrowed bodily from the Latin nominative masculine with the insertion of a meaningless *o* before the final *-us*.¹ These of course follow the rules given above. In words of more than two syllables the antepenultimate and stressed vowel is shortened, as 'ēmu-

[¹ I regard this statement as inaccurate. The *-ous* in these words does not come from the nominative ending *-us*, but is the ordinary *-ous* from L. *-osus* (through Fr.). It was added to many Latin 'adj.-tive stems', because the need of a distinctly adjectival ending was felt. Similarly in early French *-eux* was appended to adjectives when they were felt to require a termination, as in *pieux* from *pi-us*. Compare the English *capacious*, *veracious*, *hilarious*, where *-ous* is added to other stems than those in *o*. Other suffixes of Latin origin are used in the same way: e. g. *-al* in *aerial*, *ethereal*.—H.B.]

lous' from *æmulus* and in 'frivolous' from *frivulus*, except where by the 'alias' rule it is long, as in 'egregious' from *egr̄gius*. Words coined on this analogy also follow the rules. Thus 'glabrous' and 'fibrous' have the vowels long, as in the traditional pronunciation of *glabrum* and *fibrum*, where the vowels in classical Latin were short. The stressed *u* being always long we have 'lugubrious' and 'salubrious', the length being independent of the 'alias' rule. Some words ending in *-ous* are not of this class. Thus 'odorous' and 'clamorous' appear in Italian as *odoroso* and *clamoroso*. Milton has

Sonorous mettal blowing Martial sounds.

The Italian is *sonoro*, and our word was simply the Latin *sonorus* borrowed bodily at a somewhat late period. Hence the stress remains on the penultima. Skeat thought that the word would at last become 'sónorous'. It may be hoped that Milton's line will save it from the effect of a false analogy.

In classifying by stems it will be well to add, where possible, words of Greek origin. Except in some late introductions Greek words, except when introduced bodily, have been treated as if they came through Latin, and some of the bodily introductions are in the same case. Thus 'anæsthetic' is spelt with the Latin diphthong and the Latin *c*. Even 'skeleton' had a *c* to start with, while the modern and wholly abominable 'kaleidoscope' is unprincipled on the face of it.

Stems ending in *-ant* and *-ent*. These are participles or words formed as such. Our words have shed a syllable, thus *regentem* has become 'regent'. Disyllables follow the 'apex' rule and lengthen the first vowel, as 'agent', 'decent', 'potent'. Exceptions are 'clement' and 'present', perhaps under French influence. Words of more than two syllables with a single consonant before the termination throw the stress back and shorten a long penultima, as 'ignorant', 'president', 'confident', 'adjutant'. Where there are two heavy consonants, the stress remains on the penultima, as 'consultant', 'triumphant', even when one of the consonants is not pronounced, as 'reminiscent'. In some cases the Latinists seem to have deliberately altered the natural pronunciation. Thus Gower has 'ápparáunt', but the word became 'appárent' before Shakespeare's time, and later introductions such as 'adherent' followed it.

What right 'adjacent' has to its long vowel and penultimate stress I do not know, but it cannot be altered now.

Stems ending in -ato and -uto. These are mostly past participles, but many of them are used in English as verbs. It must be admitted that the disyllabic words are not wholly constant to a principle. Those verbs that come from *-latum* consistently stress the last vowel, as 'dilate', 'relate', 'collate'. So does 'create', because of one vowel following another. Of the rest all the words of any rank have the stress on the penultima, as 'vibrate', 'frustrate', 'migrate', 'castrate', 'pulse', 'vacate'. Thus Pope has

The whisper, that to greatness still too near,
Perhaps, yet vibrates on his Sov'reign's ear,

and Shelley

Music, when soft voices die,
Vibrates in the memory.

There are, however, verbs of no literary account which in usage either vary in the stress or take it on the latter syllable. Such are 'locate', 'orate', 'negate', 'placate', and perhaps 'rotate'. With most of these we could well dispense. 'Equate' is mainly a technical word. Dictionaries seem to prefer the stress on the ultima, but some at least of the early Victorian mathematicians said 'équate', and the pronunciation is to be supported. Trisyllabic verbs throw the stress back and shorten the penultima, as 'désolat', 'súffocat', 'scíntillat'. Even words with heavy double consonants have adopted this habit. Thus where Browning has (like Milton and Cowper)

I the Trinity illústrate
Drinking water'd orange pulp,
In three sips the Arian frustrate,
While he drains his at one gulp,

it is now usual to say 'illustrate'.

Adjectives of this class take as early a stress as they can, as 'ómate', 'pínnate', 'délicate', 'fórtunate'. Nouns from all these words throw the accent back and shorten or obscure all but the penultimate vowel, as 'ignorance', 'evaporation'.

Stems in -ia. Here even disyllables shorten the penultima, as 'copy', 'province', while longer words throw the stress back as well as shorten the penultima, as 'injury', 'colony', while 'ignominy' almost lost its penultimate vowel, and therefore threw back the stress to the first

syllable. Shakespeare frankly writes the word as a tri-syllable,

Thy ignomy sleep with thee in the grave.

Milton restored the lost syllable, often eliding the final vowel, as in

Exile, or ignominy, or bonds, or pain.

Even with heavy consonants we have the early stress, as in 'industry'. Greek words follow the same rules, as 'agony', 'melody'. Some words of this class have under French influence been further abbreviated, as 'concord'.

Corresponding stems in -io keep the same rules. Perhaps the only disyllable is 'study'; the shortening of a stressed *u* shows its immediate derivation from the old French *estudie*. Trisyllabic examples are 'colloquy', 'ministry', 'perjury'. Many words of this class have been further abbreviated in their passage through French. Such are 'benefice', 'divorce', 'office', 'presage', 'suffrage', 'vestige', 'adverb', 'homicide', 'proverb'. The stress in 'divorce' is due to the long vowel and the two consonants. A few of these words have been borrowed bodily from Latin, as 'odium', 'tedium', 'opprobrium'.

Stems in -do and -to (-so). These words lose the final Latin syllable and keep the stress on the vowel which bore it in Latin. The stressed vowel, except in *au*, *eu*, is short, even when, as in 'vivid', 'florid', it was long in classical Latin. This, of course, is in accord with the English pronunciation of Latin. Examples are 'acid', 'tepid', 'rigid', 'horrid', 'humid', 'lurid', 'absurd', 'tacit', 'digit', 'deposit', 'compact', 'complex', 'revise', 'response', 'acute'. Those which have the suffix -es prefixed throw the stress back, as 'honest', 'modest'. Those which have the suffix -men prefixed also throw the stress back, as 'moment', 'pigment', 'torment', and to the antepenultima, if there be one, as 'argument', 'armament', 'emolument', the penultimate vowel becoming short or obscure. In 'temperament' the tendency of the second syllable to disappear has carried the stress still further back. We may compare 'Séptuagint', where *u* becomes consonantal. An exception for which I cannot account is 'cémént', but Shakespeare has 'cémént'.

Stems in -tät. These are nouns and have the stress on the antepenultima, which in Latin bore the secondary stress. They of course show the usual shortening of the vowels

with the usual exceptions. Examples are 'charity', 'equity', 'liberty', 'ferocity', 'authority', and with long antepenultima 'immunity', 'security', 'university'. With no vowel before the penultima the long quality is, as usual, preserved, as in 'satiety'.

Stems in -oso. These are adjectives and throw the stress back to the antepenultima, if there be one. In disyllables the penultimate vowel is long as in 'famous', 'vinous'; in longer words the antepenultimate vowel is short, as 'criminous', 'generous'. Many, however, fall under the 'alias' rule, as 'ingenious', 'odious', while those which have *i* in the penultimate run the two last syllables into one, as 'pernicious', 'religious', 'vicious'. A few late introductions, coming straight from the Latin, retained the Latin stress, as 'morose', 'verbose'.

Stems in -tōrio and -sōrio. In these words the stress goes back to the fourth syllable from the end, this in Latin having the secondary stress, or, as in 'circulatory', 'ambulatory', even further. In fact the *o*, which of course is shortened, tends to disappear. Examples are 'declamatory', 'desultory', 'oratory', 'predatory', 'territory'. Three consonants running, as in 'perfūctory', keep the stress where it has to be in a trisyllable, such as 'victory'. So does a long vowel before *r* and another consonant, as in 'precurory'. Otherwise two consonants have not this effect, as in 'prómontory', 'cónsistory'. In spite of Milton's

A gloomy Consistory, and them amidst
With looks agast and sad he thus bespake,

the word is sometimes mispronounced.

Stems in -ārio. These follow the same rules, except that, as in 'ádversary', combinations like *ers* are shortened and the stress goes back; and that words ending in *-entary*, such as 'elementary' and 'testamentary', stress the antepenultima. Examples are 'antiquary', 'honorary', 'voluntary', 'emissary'. It is difficult to see a reason for an irregular quantity in the antepenultima of some trisyllables. The general rule makes it short, as in 'granary', 'salary', but in 'library' and 'notary' it has been lengthened. The *N. E. D.* gives 'plēnary', but our grandfathers said 'plēnary'. Of course 'diary' gives a long quality to the *i*.

Stems in -ili. These seem originally to have retained the short *i*. Thus Milton's spelling is 'facil' and 'fertil' while other seventeenth-century writers give 'steril'. This

pronunciation still obtains in America, but in England the words seem to have been usually assimilated to 'fragile', as Milton spells it, which perhaps always lengthened the vowel. The penultimate vowel is short.

Stems in -il. Here the long *i* is retained, and in disyllables the penultima is lengthened, as in 'anile', 'senile', 'virile'. There is no excuse for following the classical quantity in the former syllables of any of these words. As an English word 'sedilia' shortens the antepenultimate, like 'tibia' and the rest, the 'alias' rule not applying when the vowel is *i*.

Stems in -ibili. These mostly come through French and change the suffix into *-ble*. Disyllables lengthen the penultima, as 'able', 'stable', 'noble', while 'mobile', as in French, lengthens its latter vowel. Trisyllables shorten and stress the antepenultimate, as 'placable', 'equable', but of course *u* remains long, as in 'mutable'. Longer words throw the stress further back, except mere negatives, like 'implacable', and words with heavy consonants such as 'delectable'. Examples are 'miserable', 'admirable', 'intolerable', 'despicable'. The Poet Laureate holds that in these words Milton kept the long Italian *a* of the penultimate or secondary stress.

Fall'n Cherube, to be weak is miserable.

In English we have naturalized *-able* as a suffix and added it to almost any verb, as 'laughable', 'indescribable', 'desirable'. The last word may have been taken from French. The form 'desiderable' occurs from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. Originally 'acceptable' threw the stress back, as in Milton's

So fit, so acceptable, so Divine,
but the double mute has brought it into line with 'delectable'. Nowadays one sometimes hears 'dispútable', 'despíicable', but these are intolerable vulgarisms.

Suffixes in -ili and -ili. These words mostly lengthen the *i* and make the usual shortenings, as 'missile', 'sessile', 'textile', 'volatile', but of course 'futile'. Exceptions which I cannot explain are 'fossil' and 'fusile'.

Suffix in -ali. These adjectives shorten the *-a* and, with the usual exceptions, the preceding vowels, as 'dóctrinal', 'ffilial', 'líberal', 'márital', 'medicinal', but of course by the 'alias' rule 'arbóreal' (not a classical word in Latin) and 'génial'. Words like 'national' and 'rational' were

treated like trisyllables, which they now are. The stress is on the antepenultima except when heavy consonants bring it on to the penultima, as in 'sepulcral', 'parental', 'triumphal'.

Those who say 'doctrinal' on the ground that the second vowel is long in Latin commit themselves to 'medicinal', 'natural', 'nutriment', 'instrument', and, if their own principle be applied, they make false quantities by the dozen every day of their lives.

Three words mostly mispronounced are, from their rarity, perhaps not past rescue. They are 'décanal', 'ruridécanal', and 'prébendal'. There is no more reason for saying 'decanal' than for saying 'matrónal' or for saying 'prébendal' than for saying 'caléndar'. Of course words like 'tremendous', being imported whole, keep the original stress. In our case the Latin words came into existence as *décanalis*, *prébendalis*, parallel with *naturalis*, which gives us 'natural'. That mostly wrong-headed man, Burgon of Chichester, was correct in speaking of his rights or at any rate his claims as 'décanal'.

Stems in -lo. Of these 'stimulus' and 'villa' have been borrowed whole, while *umbella* is corrupted into 'umbrella'. Disyllables lengthen the penultima, as 'stable', 'title', 'pupil'. Under French influence 'disciple' follows their example. In longer words the usual shortenings are made, as in 'frivolous', 'ridiculous'. The older words in *-ulō* change the suffix into *-le*, as 'uncle', 'maniple', 'tabernacle', 'conventicle', 'receptacle', 'panicle'. Later words retain the *u*, as 'vestibule', 'reticule', 'molecule'.

Stems in -no. The many words of this class are a grief to the classifier, who seeks in vain for reasons. Thus 'german' and 'germane' have the same source and travelled, it seems, by the same road through France. The Latin *hyacinthinus* and *adamantinus* are parallel words, yet Milton has 'hyacinthin' for the one and 'adamantine' for the other. One classification goes a little way. Thus 'human' and 'urban' must have come through French, 'humane' and 'urbane' direct from Latin. On the other hand while 'meridian' and 'quartan' are French, 'publican', 'veteran', and 'oppidan' are Latin. Words with a long *i*, if they came early through France, shorten the vowel, as 'doctrine', 'discipline', 'medicine', and 'masculine', while 'genuine', though a later word, followed them, but 'anserine' and 'leonine' did not. Disyllables seem to

prefer the stress on the ultima, as 'divine', 'supine', but even these are not consistent. Some critics would scan Cassio's words

The dívine Desdemona,

though Shakespeare nowhere else has this stress, while Shelley has. Shelley, too, has

She cannot know how well the súpine slaves
Of blind authority read the truth of things.

The grammatical term, too, is 'súpine'. Later introductions also have this stress, as 'bóvine', 'cánine', 'équine'. The last word is not always understood. At any rate Halliwell-Phillips, referring to a well-known story of Shakespeare's youth, says that the poet probably attended the theatre 'in some equine capacity'. As it is agreed that 'bovine' and 'equine' lengthen the former vowel, we ought by analogy to say 'cánine', as probably most people do. Words of more than two syllables have the stress on the antepenultima and the vowel is short, as in 'libertine', 'adulterine', but of course 'úterine'. When heavy consonants bring the stress on to the penultima, the *i* is shortened, as in 'clandestín(e)', 'intestín(e)', and so in like disyllables, as 'doctrín(e)'. The modern words 'morphin(e)' and 'strychnin(e)', coined, the one from Morpheus and the other from the Greek name of the plant known to botanists as *Withania somnifera*, correctly follow 'doctrine' in shortening the *i*, though another pronunciation is sometimes heard.

Stems in -tudin. These shorten the antepenultima, as 'plenitude', 'solitude', with the usual exceptions, such as 'fortitude'.

Stems in -tion. These words retain the suffix, which in early days was disyllabic, as it sometimes is in Shakespeare, for instance in Portia's

Before a friend of this descripción
Shall lose a hair through Bassanio's fault.

Thus they came under the 'alias' rule, and what is now the penultimate vowel is long unless it be *i*. Examples are 'nation', 'accretion', 'emotion', 'solution', while *i* is shortened in 'petition', 'munition', and the like, and left short in 'admonition' and others. In military use an exception is made by 'ration', but the pronunciation is confined to one sense of the word, and is new at that. I remember old soldiers of George III who spoke of 'rátions'. Perhaps the ugly change is due to French influence.

Originally the adjectives from these words must have lengthened the fourth vowel from the end long, as *nātiōnal*, but when *ti* became *sh* they came to follow the rule of Latin trisyllables in our pronunciation.

Stems in -ie. Of these words we have a good many, both Latin and Greek. Those that came direct keep the stress on the vowel which was antepenultimate and is in English penultimate, and this vowel is short whatever its original quantity. Examples are 'aquatic', 'italic', 'Germanic'. Words that came through French threw the stress back, as 'lúnatic'. Skeat says that 'fanatic' came through French, but he can hardly be right, for the pronunciation 'fánatic' is barely three score years old. There is no inverted stress in Milton's

Fanátic Egypt and her priests.

As for 'unique' it is a modern borrowing from French, and of late 'ántique' or 'ántic', as Shakespeare has it, has followed in one of its senses the French use. It is a pity in face of Milton's

With mask and ántique Pageantry.

and it obscures the etymological identity of 'antique' and 'antic', but the old pronunciation is irredeemable. At least the new avoids the homophonic inconvenience.

Greek words of this class used as adjectives mostly follow the same rule, as 'sporadic', 'dynamic', 'pneumatic', 'esoteric', 'philanthropic', 'emetic', 'panegyric'. As nouns the earlier introductions threw the stress back, as 'heretic', 'arithmetic', but later words follow the adjectives, as 'emetic', 'enclitic', 'panegyric'. As for 'politic', which is stressed as we stress both by Shakespeare and by Milton, it must be under French influence, though Skeat seems to think that it came straight from Latin.

Stems in -os. These words agree in being disyllabic, but otherwise they are a tiresome and quarrelsome people. For their diversity in spelling some can make a detour, since 'horror', 'pallor', 'stupor' came straight from Latin, but 'tenor', coming through French, should have joined hands with 'colour', 'honour', 'odour'. The short vowel is inevitable in 'horror' and 'pallor', the long in 'ardour', 'stupor', 'tumour'. The rest are at war, 'clamour', 'colour', 'honour', 'dolour', 'rigour', 'squalor', 'tenor', 'vigour' in the short legion, 'favour', 'labour', 'odour', 'vapour' in the long. Their camp-followers ending in -ous are under their

discipline, so that, while 'clāmorous', 'rīgorous', 'vīgorous' agree with the general rule, 'ōdorous' makes an exception to it. All the derivatives of *favor* are exceptions to the general rule, for 'favourite' and 'favorable' keep its long *a*. Of course 'lābōrious' is quite in order, and so is 'vāpid'.

Stems in -tor and -sor. These words, when they came through French, threw the stress back and shortened the penultimate, *ōrātōrem* becoming *orateur*, and then 'ōrātōr', with the stress on the antepenultimate. Others of the same type are 'auditor', 'competitor', 'senator', and Shelley has

The sister-pest, congrégator of slaves,

while 'amateur' is borrowed whole from French and stresses its ultima. Trisyllables of course shorten the first vowel, as 'crēdītōr', 'jānītōr'. Polysyllables follow the stress of the verbs; thus 'ágitate' gives 'ágitator' and 'compósē' gives 'compósítōr'. To the first class belongs 'circulator', 'educator', 'imitator', 'moderator', 'negotiator', 'prevaricator', with which 'gladiator' associates itself; to the second belongs 'competitor'. Words which came straight from Latin keep the stress of the Latin nominative, as 'creator', 'spectator', 'testator', 'coadjutor', 'assessor', to which in Walton's honour must be added 'Piscator' and 'Venator'. On 'curator' he who decides does so at his peril. On one occasion Eldon from the Bench corrected Erskine for saying 'cūrātōr'. 'Curātōr, Mr. Erskine, curātōr.' 'I am glad', was the reply, 'to be set right by so eminent a senātōr and so eloquent an orātōr as your Lordship.' Neither eminent lawyer knew much about it, but each was so far right that he stuck to the custom of his country. On other grounds Erskine might be thought to have committed himself to 'téstātōr', if not quite to the 'testy tricks' of Sally in Mrs. Gaskell's 'Ruth'.

Stems in -ero and -uro. Adjectives of this type keep the Latin stress, which thus falls on the ultima, and shorten or obscure the penultimate vowel, as 'mature', 'obscure', 'severe', 'sincere', but of course 'aūstere'. Of like form though of other origin is 'secure'. Nouns take an early stress, as 'áperture', 'sépulture', 'litérature', 'témpérature', unless two mutes obstruct, as in 'conjécture'. Of the disyllables 'nature' keeps a long penultima, while 'figure' has it short, not because of the Latin quantity, but because of the French.

The lonely word 'mediocre' lengthens its first vowel by

the 'alias' rule and also stresses it. Whether the penultima has more than a secondary stress is a matter of dispute.

Stems in -ari. These words have the stress on the ante-penultima, which they shorten, as in 'secular' or keep short as in 'jocular', 'familiar', but of course 'peculiar'.

On certain Greek words.

It will have been seen that Greek words are usually treated as Latin. Thus 'crisis' lengthens the penultima under the 'apex' rule, while 'critical' has it short under the general rule of polysyllables. Other examples of lengthening are 'bathos', 'pathos', while the long quantity is of course kept in 'colon' and 'crasis'. For the 'alias' rule we may quote 'ātheist', 'cryptogāmia', 'hōmeopathy', 'heterogēneous', 'pandemōnium', while the normal shortenings are found in 'anōnymous', 'ephēmeral', 'pandēmonium', 'ērēmite'. Ignorance of English usage has made some editors flounder on a line of Pope's:

Yes, or we must renounce the Stagirite.

The birthplace of Aristotle was of course Stagīra or, as it is now fashionable to transcribe it, Stageira, as Pope doubtless knew, but the editors who accuse him of a false quantity in Greek are on the contrary themselves guilty of one in English. The penultima in English is short whether it was long or, as in 'dynamite' and 'malachite', short in Greek.

There is, however, one distinct class of Greek words in which the Latin rule is not followed. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there were scholars who rightly or wrongly treated the Greek accent as a mark of stress. It is clear that this habit led to an inability to maintain a long quantity in an unstressed syllable. Shakespeare must have learnt his little Greek from a scholar who had this habit, for he writes 'Andrónicus' and also

I am misánthrōpos and hate mankind.

Of course all scholars shortened the first vowel of the word, and doubtless Shakespeare shortened also the third. Busby also thus spoke Greek with the result that Dryden in later life sometimes wrote epsilon instead of eta and also spoke of 'Cleoménes' and 'Iphigēnia'. As a boy at Westminster he wrote

Learn'd, Virtuous, Pious, Great, and have by this
An universal Metempsuchosis.

Macaulay with an ignorance very unusual in him rebuked his nephew for saying 'metamórfosis', and Dr. Johnson, had he been living, would have rebuked Macaulay. For the sake of our poets we ought to save 'apothéosis', which is in some danger. Garth may perhaps be forgotten,

Allots the prince of his celestial line
An Apotheosis and rights divine,

but 'Rejected Addresses' should still carry weight. In the burlesque couplet, ascribed in the first edition to the younger Colman and afterwards transferred to Theodore Hook, we have

That John and Mrs. Bull from ale and tea-houses
May shout huzza for Punch's apotheosis.

It need hardly be said that 'tea-houses' like 'grandfathers' has the stress on the antepenultimate.

There are other words of Greek origin which now break the rules, though I believe the infringement to be quite modern. First we have the class beginning with *proto*. It can hardly be doubted that our ancestors followed rule and said 'prötocol', and 'prötotype', and I suspect also 'prötomartyr'. There seems, however, to be a general agreement nowadays to keep the Greek omega. As for 'protagonist' the word is so technical and is often so ludicrously misunderstood that writers on the Greek drama would do well to retain the Greek termination and say 'protagonistes'; for 'protagonist' is very commonly mistaken and used for the opposite of 'antagonist'.

Next come words beginning with *hypo* or *hyph*. In a disyllable the vowel is long by the 'apex' rule, as in 'hyphen'. In longer words it should be short. So once it was, and we still say 'hypocaust', 'hypocrit', 'hypochondria' (whence 'hopped'), 'hypothesis', and others, but a large group of technical and scientific words seems determined to have a long *y*. It looks as though there were a belief that *y* is naturally long, though the French influence which gives us 'tyrant' does not extend to 'tyranny'. I do not know what Mr. Hardy calls his poem, but I hope he follows the old use and calls it 'The Dýnasts'. It might be thought that 'dýnasty' was safe, but it is not. Some modern words like 'dynamite' have been misused from their birth.

Another class begins with *hydro*- from the Greek word for water. None of them seem to be very old, but probably

'hydraulic' began life with a short *y*. Surely Mrs. Malaprop, when she meant 'hysterics' and said 'hydrostatics', must have used the short *y*. Of course 'hydra' which comes from the same root follows the 'apex' rule.

Words beginning with *hyper-* seem nowadays always to have a long *y* except that one sometimes hears 'hŷperbole' and 'hŷperbolical'. Of course both in *hypo-* and in *hyper-* the vowel is short in Greek, so that here at least the strange lengthening cannot be ascribed to the Grecians. The false theory of a long *y* has not affected 'cynic' or 'cynical', while 'Cyril' has been saved by being a Christian name. We may yet hope to retain *y* short in 'cylinder', 'cynosure', 'lycanthropy', 'mythology', 'pyramid', 'pyrotechnic', 'sycamore', 'synonym', 'typical'. As for 'hŷbrid' it seems as much a caprice as 'ācid', a pronunciation often heard. Though 'acrid' is a false formation it ought to follow 'vivid' and 'florid'. The 'alias' rule enforces a long *y* in 'hygiene' and 'hygienic'.

On the matter of Greek names the letter and the pulpit are grievous offenders. Once it was not so. The clergymen of the old type and the scholars of the Oxford Retrogression said Tímōthēús, because they had a sense of English and followed, consciously or unconsciously, the 'alias' rule. If there was ever an error, it was on the lips of some illiterate literate who made three syllables of the word. Now it seems fashionable to say Tímōthēús. The literate was better than this, for he at least had no theory, and frank ignorance is to be forgiven. It is no shame to a man not to know that the second *i* in 'Villiers' is as mute as that in 'Parliament' or that Bolingbroke's name began with Bull and ended with brook, but when ignorance constructs a theory it is quite another matter. The etymological theory of pronunciation is intolerable. Etymology was a charming nymph even when men had but a distant acquaintance with her, and a nearer view adds to her graces; but when she is dragged reluctant from her element she flops like a stranded mermaid. The curate says 'Deuterónómy', and on his theory ought to say 'éconómý' and 'etymológy'. When Robert Gomery—why not give the reverend poetaster his real if less elegant name—published his once popular work, every one called it 'The Omnípresence of the Deity', and Shelley had already written

And, as I look'd, the bright omnípresence
Of morning through the orient cavern flowed.

It is true that Ken a century earlier had committed himself to

Thou while below went yet on high
By Omniprésent Deity,

and later Coleridge, perhaps characteristically, had sinned with

There is one Mind, one omniprésent Mind,
but neither the bishop nor the poet would have said
'omniscience', or 'omnipoténtce'.

Another word to show signs of etymological corruption is 'évolution'. It seems to have been introduced as a technical term of the art of war, and of course, like 'dévolution', shortened the *e*. The biologists first borrowed it and later seem desirous of corrupting it. Perhaps they think of such words as 'égress', but the long vowel is right in the stressed penultimate.

One natural tendency in English runs strongly against etymology. This is the tendency to throw the stress back, which about a century ago turned 'contémpalte' into 'cóntemplate' and somewhat later 'illústrate' into 'illustre'. Shakespeare and Milton pronounced 'instinct' as we pronounce 'distinct' and 'aspect' as we pronounce 'respect'. Thus Belarius is made to say

'Tis wonder
That an invisible instinct should frame them
To royalty unlearn'd,

and Milton has

By this new felt attraction and instinct,
and also

In battailous aspéct and neerer view.

The retrogression of the stress is in these instances well established, and we cannot quarrel with it; but against some very recent instances a protest may be made. One seems to be a corruption of the War. In 1884 the *N.E.D.* recognized no pronunciation of it save 'ally', as in Romeo's

This gentleman, the prince's neer Alie.

The late Mr. B. B. Rogers in his translations of Aristophanes has of course no other pronunciation. His verses are too good to be spoiled by what began as a vulgarism. Another equally recent vulgarism, not recognized by the *N.E.D.* and bad enough to make George Russell turn in

his grave, is 'mágazine' for 'magazine'. It is not yet common, but such vulgarisms are apt to climb.

In times not quite so recent the word 'prophecy' has changed, not indeed its stress but the quantity of its final vowel. When Alford wrote 'The Queen's English', every one lengthened the last vowel, as in the verb, nor do I remember any other pronunciation in my boyhood. Now the *N.E.D.* gives the short vowel only. Alford to his own satisfaction accounted for the long vowel by the diphthong *ei* of the Greek. It is to be feared that his explanation would involve 'dynastý' and 'policy', even if it did not oblige us to turn 'Pompey' into 'Pompy'. In this case it may be suspected that the noun was assimilated to the verb, which follows the analogy of 'magnify' and 'multiply'. The voice of the people which now gives us 'prophecy' seems here to have felt the power of analogy and assuredly will prevail.

On proper names.

It is to be hoped that except in reading Latin and Greek texts we shall keep to the traditional pronunciation of proper names as it is enshrined in our poetry and other literature. We must continue to lengthen the stressed penultimate vowel in Athos, Cato, Diaco, Eros, Hebius, Lichas, Nero, Otho, Plato, Pylos, Remus, Samos, Titus, Venus and the many other disyllables wherein it was short in the ancient tongues. On the other hand we shall shorten the originally long stressed antepenultimate vowel in Brasidas, Euripides, Icarus, Lavinia, Lucilius, Lydia, Nicias, Onesimus, Pegasus, Pyramus, Regulus, Romulus, Scipio, Sisyphus, Socrates, Thucydides, and many more.

Quin, and the actors of his day, used to give to the first vowel in 'Cato' the sound of the *a* in 'father'. They probably thought that they were Italianizing such names. In fact their use was neither Latin nor English. They were like the men of to-day who speak of the town opposite Dover as 'Cally', a name neither French nor English. A town which once sent members to the English Parliament has a right to an English name. Prior rhymed it with 'Alice' and Browning has

When Fortune's malice
Lost her Calais.

Shakespeare, of course, spelt it 'Callis', and this form, which was first evicted by Pope, whom other editors servilely

followed, ought to be restored to Shakespeare's text. In the pronunciation of Cato the stage regained the English diphthong in the mouth of Garrick, whose good sense was often in evidence. It is recorded that his example was not at once followed in Scotland or Ireland. If there was any Highlander on the stage it may be hoped that he gave to the vowel the true Latin sound as it appears in 'Mactavish'.

A once well-known schoolmaster, a correspondent of Conington's, had a daughter born to him whom in his unregenerate days he christened Rosa. At a later time he became a purist in quantities, and then he shortened the *o* and took the voice out of the *s* and spoke of her and to her as Rossa. The mother and the sisters refused to acknowledge what they regarded as a touch of shamrock and clung persistently to the English flower. The good gentleman did not call his son Solōmon,¹ though this is the form which ought to be used by those who turn the traditional English 'Elkānah' into 'Elkānah', 'Abāna' into 'Abāna', and 'Zebūlun' into 'Zebūlun'. If they do not know

Poor Elkānah, all other troubles past,
For bread in Smithfield dragons hiss'd at last,

yet at least they ought to know

Of Abbāna and Pharpar, lucid streams.

The malison of Milton on their heads! If the translators of the Bible had foreseen 'Zebūlun', they would have chosen some other word than 'princes' to avoid the cacophony of 'the princes of Zebūlun'.

That these usages were familiar is evident from the pronunciation of proper, especially Biblical, names. Thus 'Bābel' and 'Bābylon', 'Nīnus' and 'Nīneveh', were spoken as unconsciously as 'Mīchael' and 'Mīchaelmas'. Nobody thought of asking the quantity of the Hebrew vowels before he spoke of 'Cāleb' and 'Bārak', of 'Gīdeon' and 'Gīlead', of 'Dēborah' and 'Abīmelech', of 'Ephraim' and 'Bēlial'. The seeming exceptions can be explained. Thus the priest said 'Hērod' because in the Vulgate he read 'Hērodes', but there was no Greek or Latin form to make him say anything else than 'Mēroz', 'Pērez', 'Sērah', 'Tēresh'. He said 'Ādam' because, although the Septuagint and other books retained the bare form of the name, there were

^[1] But pedantry would not suggest this. The New Testament has Σολομών, and the Latin Christian poets have the *o* short. True, the Vatican Septuagint has Σαλωμών, but there the vowel of the first syllable is *a*.—H. B.]

other writings in which the name was extended by a Latin termination. There was no like extension to tempt him to say anything but 'Cādesh', 'Ēdom', 'Jādon', 'Nādab'. I must admit my inability to explain 'Thōmas', but doubtless there is a reason. The abbreviated form was of course first 'Thōm' and then 'Tōm'. Possibly the pet name has claimed dominion over the classical form. As in the *herba impia* of the early botanists, these young shoots sometimes refuse to be 'trash'd for overtopping'.

A story is told of an eccentric Essex rector. He was reading in church the fourth chapter of Judges, and after 'Now Dēboāh, a prophetess', suddenly stopped, not much to the astonishment of the rustics, for they knew his ways. Then he went on 'Debō ah' Debōrah? Debōrah! Now Debōrah, a prophetess', and so on. Probably a freak of memory had reminded him that the letter was omega in the Septuagint. It will be remembered that Miss Jenkyns in *Cranford* liked her sister to call her Debōrah, 'her father having once said that the Hebrew name ought to be so pronounced', and it will not be forgotten that the good rector was too sound a scholar to read 'Debōrah' at the letter.

An anecdote of Burgon's is to the point. He had preached in St. Mary's what he regarded as an epoch-making sermon, and afterwards he walked home to Oriel with Hawkins, the famous Provost. He looked for comment and hoped for praise, but the Provost's only remark was. 'Why do you say Emmāus?' 'I don't know; isn't it Fmmāus?' 'No, no; Emmāus, Emmāus.' When Hawkins was young, in the days of George III, every one said Emmāus, and in such matters he would say, 'I will have no innovations in my time.' On the King's lips the phrase, as referring to politics, was foolish, but Hawkins used it with sense.

PS.—I had meant to cite an anecdote of Johnson. As he walked in the Strand, a man with a napkin in his hand and no hat stopt out of a tavern and said, 'Pray, Sir, is it irréparable or iirréparable that one should say?'—'The last, I think, Sir, for the adjective ought to follow the verb; but you had better consult my dictionary than me, for that was the result of more thought than you will now give me time for.' The dictionary rightly gives *irréparable*, and both the rule and example of the Doctor's *obiter dicta* (literally *obiter*) are wrong.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES AND CORRESPONDENCE

ADDENDA TO HOMOPHONES IN TRACT II

SEVERAL correspondents complain of the incompleteness of the list of Homophones in Tract II. The object of that list was to convince readers of the magnitude of the mischief, and the consequent necessity for preserving niceties of pronunciation : evidence of its incompleteness must strengthen its plea. The following words may be added ; they are set here in the order of the literary alphabet.

Add to Table I (p. 7)

band, ¹ <i>a tie</i> , ² <i>a company</i> .	limb, ¹ <i>member</i> , ² <i>edge</i> , ³ <i>limn.</i>
bend, ¹ <i>verb</i> , ² <i>heraldic sub.</i>	limbei, ¹ <i>shaft of cart</i> (<i>verb in artillery</i>), ² <i>naut. subs.</i> , ³ <i>adj. pliant</i> .
bay, ¹ <i>tree</i> , ² <i>arm of sea</i> , ³ <i>window</i> , ⁴ <i>barking of dog</i> , and ⁵ <i>at bay</i> ,	loom, ¹ <i>subs.</i> , ² <i>v.</i>
⁵ <i>a dam</i> , ⁶ <i>of antler</i> , ⁷ <i>a colour</i>	nice, <i>gneiss</i> .
blaze, ¹ <i>of flame</i> , ² <i>to sound forth</i> .	ounce, ¹ <i>animal</i> , ² <i>a weight</i> .
bluff, ¹ <i>adj.</i> & ² <i>sub.</i> = <i>broad</i> = <i>fronted</i> , ² <i>blinker</i> , ³ <i>sub. and v.</i> <i>confusing</i> ¹ and ² .	plash, ¹ = <i>pleach</i> , ² <i>a puddle</i> .
boom, ¹ <i>to hum</i> , ² = <i>beam</i> .	port, ¹ <i>demeanour</i> , & ² <i>military v.</i> , ² <i>haven</i> , ³ <i>gate</i> & ⁴ <i>naut. = port-hole</i> .
cant, ¹ <i>whine</i> , ² <i>to tilt</i> .	⁴ <i>= larboard</i> , ⁵ <i>a wine</i> .
chaff, ¹ <i>of wheat</i> , ² = <i>chafe</i> (<i>slang</i>).	shingle, ¹ <i>a wooden tile</i> , ² <i>gravel</i> ,
cove, ¹ <i>a recess</i> , ² = <i>chap</i> (<i>slang</i>).	³ <i>(in pl.) a disease</i> .
file, ¹ <i>string</i> , ² <i>rasp</i> , ³ = <i>to defile</i> .	shrub, ¹ <i>a bush</i> , ² <i>a drink</i> .
grave, ¹ <i>sub.</i> , ² <i>adj.</i>	smack, ¹ <i>a sounding blow</i> , ² <i>a fishing boat</i> , ³ <i>taste</i> .
hind, ¹ <i>fem. of stag</i> , ² <i>a peasant</i> , ³ <i>adj. of behind</i> .	throw, <i>throe</i> .

Also note that *so* should be added to *sew*, *sow*, and that the words *leech*, *leach*, are not sufficiently credited with etymological variety : [see below p. 33].

To Table II add

when, *wen*,

To Table VIII

The following words, the absence of which has been noted, are not true homophones :—

crack	gentle	stem
fool	interest	trip
fume	palm	

To Table IX add

must ¹obs ² new wine, ²verb.

To Shakespearean obsoletes p. 27 add
limn, *lost in* limb.

THE SKILFUL LEECH

The Poet Laureate has pointed out that several useful words have been lost to the English language because their identity in sound with other words renders it impossible to use them without the risk either of being misunderstood or of calling up undesirable associations. It is owing to this cause that English—or, at least, the English of Great Britain—has no word that can correctly be used as a general designation for a member of the healing profession. In America, I believe, the word is ‘physician’; but in England that appellation belongs to one branch of the profession exclusively. The most usual term here is ‘doctor’; but the M.D. rightly objects to the application of this title to his professional brother who has no degree; and in a university town to say that John Smith is a doctor would be inconveniently ambiguous. ‘Medical man’ is cumbersome, and has the further disadvantage (in these days) of not being of common gender. Now the lack of any proper word for a meaning so constantly needing to be expressed is certainly a serious defect in modern (insular) English. The Americans have some right to crow over us here; but their ‘physician’ is a long word; and though it has been good English in the sense of *medicus* for six hundred years, it ought by etymology to mean what *physicien* does in French, and *physicist* in modern English. Our ancestors were better off in this respect than either we or the Americans. The only native

word to denote a practiser of the healing art is *leech*, which is better than the foreign 'physician' because it is shorter. It was once a term of high dignity: Chaucer could apply it figuratively to God, as the healer of souls; and even in the sixteenth century a poet could address his lady as 'My sorowes leech'. Why can we not so use it now? Why do we not speak of 'The Royal College of Leeches'? Obviously, because a word of the same form happens to be the name of an ugly little animal of disgusting habits. If I were to introduce my medical attendant to a friend with the words 'This is my leech', the gentleman (or lady) so presented would think I was indulging in the same sort of pleasantry as is used when a coachman is called a 'whip'; and he (or she) would probably not consider the joke to be in the best of taste. Of course all educated people know that it was once not unusual to speak of a man of medicine as a 'leech'; but probably there are many who imagine that this designation was a disparaging allusion to the man's tool of trade, and that it could be applied only to inferior members of the profession. The ancient appellation of the healer is so far obsolete that if I were to answer a question as to a man's profession with the words 'Oh, he is a leech', there would be some risk of being misunderstood to mean that he was a money-lender.

Etymologists generally have regarded the name of the bloodsucking animal as the same word with *leech* a physician, the assumption being that the animal received its name from its use as a remedial agent. But the early forms, both in English and Low German, show that the words are originally unconnected. The English for *medicus* was in the tenth century *læce* or *léce*, and in the thirteenth century *leche*; the word for *sanguisuga* was in the tenth century *lyce*, and in the thirteenth century *liche*. According to phonetic law the latter word should have become *litch* in modern English; but it very early underwent a punning alteration which made it homophonous with the ancient word for physician. The unfortunate consequence is that the English language has hopelessly lost a valuable word, for which it has never been able to find a satisfactory substitute.

H. B.

DIFFERENTIATION OF HOMOPHONES

On this very difficult question the attitude of a careful English speaker is shown in the following extract from a letter addressed to us :

METAL, METTLE: and PRINCIPAL, PRINCIPLE

' I find that I do not *naturally* distinguish *metal* and *mettle* in pronunciation, tho' when there is any danger of ambiguity I say *metal* for the former and *met'l* for the latter; and I should probably do so (without thinking about it) in a public speech. In my young days the people about me usually pronounced *met'l* for both. Theoretically I think the distinction is a desirable one to make; the fact that the words are etymologically identical seems to me irrelevant. The words are distinctly two in modern use: when we talk of *mettle* (meaning spiritedness) there is in our mind no thought whatever of the etymological sense of the word, and the recollection of it, if it occurred, would only be disturbing. So I intend in future to pronounce *metal* as *metal* (when I don't forget). And I am not sure that *metal* is, strictly speaking, a "spelling-pronunciation": It is possible that the difference in spelling originated in a difference of pronunciation, not the other way about. For *metal* in its literal sense was originally a scientific word, and in that sense may have been pronounced carefully by people who would pronounce it carelessly when they used it in a colloquial transferred sense approaching to slang.

' The question of *principal* and *principle* is different. When I was young, educated people in my circle always, I believe, distinguished them; so to this day when I hear *principal* pronounced as *principle* it gives me a squirm, tho' I am afraid nearly everybody does it now. That the words are etymologically distinct does not greatly matter; it is of more importance that I have sometimes been puzzled to know which word a speaker meant; if I remember right, I once had to ask.

' It would be worth while to distinguish *flower* and *flour* (which originally, like *metal* and *mettle*, were the same word); yet in practice it is not easy to make the difference audible. The homophony is sometimes inconvenient.'

CORRECTION TO TRACT II

On p. 37 of TRACT II the words 'the Anglo-prussian society which Mr. Jones represents' have given offence and appear to be inaccurate. The German title of the series in which Jones's Dictionary is one has the following arrangement of words facing the English title :

HERAUSGEGEBEN
UND
DER «ASSOCIATION PHONÉTIQUE INTERNATIONALE» GEWIDMET
VON
H. MICHAELIS,

and this misled me. I am assured that, though the dictionary may be rightly described as Anglo-Prussian, the Phonetic Association is Gallo-Scandinavian. In behalf of the S.P.E. I apologize to the A.Ph.I. for my mistake which has led one of its eminent associates to accuse me of bearing illwill towards the Germans. The logic of that reproach baffles me utterly.

[R. B.]

SOME LEXICAL MATTERS

FAST = QUICK or FIRM

'An Old Cricketer' writes:

'After reading your remarks on the ambiguity of the word *fast* (Tract III, p 12) I read in the report of a Lancashire cricket match that *Makepeace* was the only batsman who was *fast-footed*. But for the context and my knowledge of the game I should have concluded that Makepeace kept his feet immovably on the crease; but the very opposite was intended. At school we used to translate $\pi\delta\delta\alpha\sigma$ $\omega\kappa\nu\sigma$ $\chi\lambda\lambda\epsilon\nu\sigma$ "swift-footed Achilles", and I took that to mean that Achilles was a sprinter. I suppose *quick-footed* would be the epithet for Makepeace.'

SPRINTER is a good word, though *Sprinting Achilles* could not be recommended.

BRATTLE

A correspondent from Newcastle writes advocating the recognition of the word *brattle* as descriptive of thunder. It is a good old echo-word used by Dunbar and Douglas and Burns and by modern English writers. It is familiar through the first stanza of Burns's poem 'To a Mouse'.

Wee sleekit cow'rin tim'ious beastie,
O what a panic's in thy breastie.
Thou need na start awa sae hasty
Wi' bick'ling brattle. . . .

which is not suggestive of thunder. The *V.E.D.* explains this as 'to run with brattling feet, to scamper'.

In Burns's 'A Winter Night', it is the noisy confusion of biting *Boreas* in the bare trees and bushes :

I thought me on the ourie cattle
Or silly sheep, wha bide this brattle
O' winter war.

It is possible that *brattle* has fallen into disuse through too indiscriminate application. After Burns's famous poem the word can establish itself only in the sense of a scurrying dry noise : it is too small for thunder.

We would call attention to the principle involved in this judgement, for it is one of the main objects of our society to assist and guide Englishmen in the use of their language by fully exposing the facts that should determine their practice. Every word has its history, and no word can prosper in the speech or writing of those who do not respect its inherited and unalterable associations ; these cannot be got rid of by ignoring them. Littré in the preface to his dictionary claims for it this pre-eminent quality of usefulness, that it will enable his countrymen to speak and write good French by acquainting them with historic tradition, and he says that it was enthusiasm for this one purpose that sustained him in his great work. Its object was to harmonize the present use of the language with the past usage, in order that the present usage may possess all the fullness, richness, and certitude which it can have, and which naturally belong to it. His words are : 'Avant tout, et pour ramener à une idée mère ce qui va être expliqué dans la *Préface*, je dirai, définissant ce dictionnaire, qu'il embrasse et combine l'usage présent de la langue et son usage passé, afin de donner à l'usage présent toute la plénitude et la sûreté qu'il comporte.'

It is the intention of our society to offer only expert and well-considered opinion on these literary matters, which are often popularly handled in the newspapers and journals as fit subjects for private taste and uninformed prejudice: and since the Oxford Dictionary has done more fully for English what Littré did for French, our task is comparatively easy. But experts cannot be expected, all of them, to have the self-denying zeal of Émile Littré, and the worth of our tracts will probably improve with the increase of our subscribers.

BICKER

As Burns happens to use *bickering* as his epithet for the mouse's brattle, we may take this word as another illustration of Littré's principle. The *N.E.D.* gives the original meaning as *skirmish*, and quotes Shakespeare,

If I longer stay
We shall begin our ancient bickerings,

which a man transposing the third and fourth words might say to-day without rising above colloquial speech; but there is another allied signification which Milton has in

Smoak and bickering flame;

and this is followed by many later writers. It would seem therefore, if the word is to have a special sense, that it must be focused in the idea of something that both wavers and skirmishes, and this suggests another word which caught our eye in the dictionary, that is

BRANGLE

It is defined in the *N.E.D.* as 'a brawl, wrangle, squabble and marked *obsolete*'. It seems to differ from its numerous synonyms by the suggestion of what we call a muddle: that is an active wrangling which has become inextricably confused.

SURVIVALS IN LANCASHIRE SPEECH

Mr. Ernest Stenhouse sends us notes on Tract II, from which we extract the following:

'*Poll* (= to cut the hair) is still familiar in Lancashire. *Tickle* (unstable) is obsolescent but not yet *obsolete*. As a child I often heard *meterly* (= moderately): e.g. *meterly fausse* (? false) = moderately cunning. It may still be in use. *Bout* (= without = A.S. *butan*) is commonly heard.

'The words tabulated in Tract II, p. 34, and the following pairs are not homophones in Lancashire: stork, stalk: pattern, patten; because although the *r* in stork and pattern is not trilled as in Scotland, it is distinctly indicated by a modification of the preceding vowel, somewhat similar to that heard in the *ore* words (p. 35).

'Homophony may arise from a failure to make distinctions that are recognized in P.S.P. Thus in Lancashire the diphthong sound in *flow*, *snow*, *bone*, *coal*, *those*, &c., is very often pronounced as a pure vowel (cf. French *eau*, *mot*): hence confusion arises between *flow* and *flaw*, *sow* and *saw*, *coal* and *call*: both these vowel sounds tending to become indistinguishable from the French *eau*.'

FEASIBLE

Feasible is a good example of a word which appears in danger of being lost through incorrect and ignorant use. It can very well happen that a word which is not quite comfortable may feel its way to a useful place in defiance of etymology; and in such cases it is pedantry to object to its instinctive vagaries. But *feasible* is a well-set comfortable word which is being ignorantly deprived of its useful definite signification. In the following note Mr. Fowler puts its case clearly, and his quotations, being typically illustrative of the manner in which this sort of mischief comes about, are worthy of attention.

'With those who feel that the use of an ordinary word for an ordinary notion does not do justice to their vocabulary or sufficiently exhibit their cultivation, who in fact prefer the *stylish* to the *working* word, *feasible* is now a prime favourite. Its proper sense is "capable of being done, accomplished, or carried out". That is, it means the same as *possible* in one of the latter's senses, and its true function is to be used instead of *possible* where that might be ambiguous. *A thunderstorm is possible* (but not *feasible*). Irrigation is possible (or, indifferently, *feasible*). *A counter-revolution is possible*; i.e., (a) one may for all we know happen, or (b) we can if we choose bring one about; but, if (b) is the meaning, *feasible* is better than *possible* because it cannot properly bear sense a, and therefore obviates ambiguity.'

'The wrong use of *feasible* is that in which, by a slipshod extension, it is allowed to have also the other sense of

possible, and that of *probable*. This is described by the highest authority as “hardly a justifiable sense etymologically, and . . . recognized by no dictionary”. It is however becoming very common ; in all the following quotations, it will be seen that the natural word would be either *possible* or *probable*, one of which should have been chosen :—Continuing, Mr. Wood said: “I think it is very feasible that the strike may be brought to an end this week, and it is a significant coincidence that . . .”./ Witness said it was quite feasible that if he had had night binoculars he would have seen the iceberg earlier./ We ourselves believe that this is the most feasible explanation of the tradition. / This would appear to offer a feasible explanation of the scaffold puzzle.’

PROTAGONIST

Mr. Sargeaunt (on p. 26) suggests that we might do well to keep the full Greek form of this word, and speak and write *protagonistes*. Familiarity with *Agonistes* in the title of Milton’s drama, where it is correctly used as equivalent to ‘mighty champion’, would be misleading, and the rejection of the English form ‘protagonist’ seems otherwise undesirable. The following remarks by Mr. Fowler show that popular diction is destroying the word ; and if ignorance be allowed its way we shall have a good word destroyed.

‘The word that has so suddenly become a prime favourite with journalists, who more often than not make it mean champion or advocate or defender, has no right whatever to any of those meanings, and almost certainly owes them to the mistaking of the first syllable (representing Greek *πρῶτος* “first”) for *πρό* “on behalf of”—a mistake made easy by the accidental resemblance to *antagonist*. “Accidental”, since the Greek *ἀγωνιστής* has different meanings in the two words, in one “combatant”, but in the other “play-actor”. The Greek *πρωταγωνιστής* means the actor who takes the chief part in a play—a sense readily admitting of figurative application to the most conspicuous personage in any affair. The deuteragonist and tritagonist take parts of second and third importance, and to talk of several protagonists, or of a chief protagonist or the like, is an absurdity. In the newspapers it is a rarity to meet *protagonist* in a legitimate sense ; but two examples of it are put first in the following collection. All the others are outrages on this learned-sounding word, because some of them distinguish between

chief protagonists and others who are not chief, some state or imply that there are more protagonists than one in an affair, and the rest use *protagonist* as a mere synonym for advocate.

‘Legitimate uses: *The “cher Halevy” who is the protagonist of the amazing dialogue. / Marco Landi, the protagonist and narrator of a story which is skilfully contrived and excellently told, is a fairly familiar type of soldier of fortune.*

‘Absurd uses with *chief*, &c.: *The chief protagonist is a young Nonconformist minister. / Unlike a number of the leading protagonists in the Home Rule fight, Sir Edward Carson was not in Parliament when. . . . / It presents a spiritual conflict, centred about its two chief protagonists, but shared in by all its characters.*

‘Absurd plural uses: *One of the protagonists of that glorious fight for Parliamentary Reform in 1866 is still actively among us. / One of these immense protagonists must fall, and, as we have already foreshadowed, it is the Duke. / By a tragic but rapid process of elimination most of the protagonists have now been removed. / As on a stage where all the protagonists of a drama assemble at the end of the last act. / That letter is essential to a true understanding of the relations of the three great protagonists at this period. / The protagonists in the drama, which has the motion and structure of a Greek tragedy (Fy! fy!—a Greek tragedy and protagonists?).*

‘Confusions with *advocate*, &c.: *The new Warden is a strenuous protagonist of that party in Convocation. / Mr —, an enthusiastic protagonist of militant Protestantism. / The chief protagonist on the company’s side in the latest railway strike, Mr —. / It was a happy thought that placed in the hands of the son of one of the great protagonists of Evolution the materials for the biography of another. / But most of the protagonists of this demand have shifted their ground. / As for what the medium himself or his protagonists may think of them—for etymological purposes that is neither here nor there.*

‘Perhaps we need not consider the Greek scholar’s feelings; he has many advantages over the rest of us, and cannot expect that in addition he shall be allowed to forbid us a word that we find useful. Is it useful? or is it merely a pretentious blundering substitute for words that are useful? *Pro-* in *protagonist* is not the opposite of *anti-*; *-agonist* is not the same as in *antagonist*; *advocate* and

champion and *defender* and *combatant* are better words for the wrong senses given to *protagonist*; and *protagonist* in its right sense of *the* (not *a*) chief actor in an affair has still work to do if it could only be allowed to mind its own business.'

AMERICAN APPRECIATION

We are glad to reprint the following short extracts from the *New York Times Book Review and Magazine*, September 26, 1920.

'THE CAMPAIGN FOR PURE ENGLISH

'Among those who joined it (the S.P.E.) immediately were Arthur J. Balfour, A. C. Bradley, Austin Dobson, Thomas Hardy, J. W. Mackail, Gilbert Murray, Mrs. Humphry Ward, and Mrs. Wharton.... The rallying of these men and women of letters was not more significant than the prompt adhesion of the Professors of English in the various British Universities: W. M. Dixon, Oliver Elton, E. S. Gordon, C. H. Herford, W. P. Ker, G. C. Moore-Smith, F. W. Moorman, A. Quiller-Couch, George Saintsbury, and H. C. K. Wyld....

'There is a peril to the proper development of the language in offensive affectations, in persistent pedantry, and in other results of that comprehensive ignorance of the history of English, which we find plentifully revealed in many of our grammars. It is high time that men who love the language, who can use it deftly and forcibly, and who are acquainted with the principles and the processes of its growth, should raise the standard of independence....

'It is encouraging to realize that the atrophy of the word-making habit is less obvious in the United States than it is in Great Britain.... We cannot but regret that it is not now possible to credit to their several inventors American compounds of a delightful expressiveness—*windjammer*, *loan-shark*, *scare-head*, and that more delectable *pussy-footed*—all of them verbal creations with an imaginative quality almost Elizabethan in its felicity, and all of them examples of the purest English.... We Americans made the compound *farm-hand*, and employ it in preference to the British [English?] *agricultural labourer*.

'The attention of the officers of the society may be called to the late Professor Lounsbury's lively and enlightening History of the English Language, and to Professor George Philip Krapp's illuminating study of Modern English'

BRANDER MATTHEWS.'

REPORT

Of the proceedings of the Society for the first year ending
Xmas, 1920.

The Society still remains governed by the small committee of its original founders: the support of the public and the press has been altogether satisfactory: the suggestions and programme which the committee originally put forward have met with nothing but favourable criticism; no opposition has been aroused, and we are therefore encouraged to meet the numerous invitations that we have received from all parts of the English-speaking world to make our activities more widely known. The sale of the Tracts has been sufficient to pay their expenses; and we are in this respect very much indebted to the Oxford University Press for its generous co-operation; for it has enabled us to offer our subscribers good workmanship at a reasonable price. The publication of this Tract IV closes our first 'year': we regret that the prevalent national disturbances have extended it beyond the solar period, but the conditions render explanation and apology needless.

Our list shows 188 members, and their names include many well-known men of letters. Professors of Literature, Editors, Journalists, and others interested in the history and present condition of the language. Nineteen members sent donations (above 10s. 6d.) which together amounted to about £40; and thirty-two sent subscriptions of ten shillings for the supply of one year's publications.

To these subscribers (whose names are printed in the list below) all the four Tracts for this year have been sent: and it will appear that since they might have bought the four Tracts for 7s. 6d., they have made a donation of 2s. 6d. apiece to the funds of the Society. This margin is very useful and we hope that they will renew their 10s. subscription in advance for the ensuing year. That will ensure their receiving the

Society's papers as they are issued, and it will much assist the machinery of publication. Also Members who have not hitherto subscribed are now specially invited to do so. They can judge of the Society's work, and can best support it in this way. The publications of 1921 *will be sent as soon as issued to all such subscribers.*

Subscriptions may be sent to the Secretary, L. Pearsall Smith, 11 St. Leonard's Terrace, Chelsea, London, S.W. to whom all communications should be addressed, or they may be paid direct to 'Treasurer of S.P.E.', Barclay's Bank, High Street, Oxford.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS

- *†Aikin, Dr. W. A., 66 Bedford Gardens.
- *Bennett, Arnold, 80 Piccadilly.
- Bottomley, Gordon, The Sheila, Silverdale, Caiorth.
- Bundley, H. H., 25 Madingley Road Cambridge.
- *Brown, Miss E. O., Bournstream, Wotton-under-Edge.
- Carleton, Big.-Gen. L. R., Holmdale, Gasmere.
- *Case, Thomas, Corpus Christi College, Oxford.
- Curtis, James, 179 Marylebone Road, N.W. 1.
- Dixon, Prof J. Main, Univ. S. California, Los Angeles.
- Elliott, Rev.-Adml. H. V., 13 South Road, Weston-super-Mare.
- Fly, Miss Agnes, Fairland House, nr. Bristol.
- Gainsford, W. D., Skendleby Hall, Spilsbury.
- *Harman, Capt. H. A. D.S.O., King's College, Lagos, S. Nigeria.
- Headlam, Rev. Stewart, Wavertree, St. Margaret-on-Thames.
- *Henderson, T., Upumulo Napumulo, Natal.
- Horniman, Miss A. E. F., 1h. Montague Mansions, W. 1.
- Hunt, Howard L., Univ. S. California, Los Angeles.
- *Lacy, Miss H., Highbury Crescent, N. 5.
- †Lawrence, A., 13 Norfolk Crescent, W. 2.
- Lindsay, Prof. W. M., 5 Howard Place, St. Andrews.
- Melland, E. Alport, Bakewell.
- Morton, G. H., 13 Kimberley Terrace, Tredegar.
- *Muirhead, L., Hasleley Court, Wallingford.
- *Nickerson, Rev. D., Newton-on-Ouse, York.
- *O'May, J., c/o Messrs. Barker & Co., Singapore.
- Partington, S., Sunny Brow, Eden Mount, Grange on Sands, Lancs.
- *Pikeing-Jones, J., West Africa House, Water Street, Liverpool
- Portal, Miss E., 82 Carlisle Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W.
- *Pryor, Mrs., Lannock Manor, Stevenage, Herts.
- Ramsden, William, Marshfield, Huddersfield.

Reade, H. V., 181 Queen's Gate, S.W.
 Rieder, Madame A. Lyceum Club, 128 Piccadilly.
 Robinson, Frances G., The Towers, Sneyd Park, nr. Bristol.
 Samuel, Rt. Hon. Sir Herbert, 31 Porchester Terrace, Hyde Park.
 Sampson, John, University Library, Liverpool.
 Scrivener, Miss J., The Ladies' College, Cheltenham.
 Sheldon, E. W., 46 Park Avenue, New York.
 Shephard, Artur, 46 Edwardes Square, W. 8.
 Strachey, Lady, 51 Gordon Square, W.C.
 Teixeira de Mattos, A., 9 Cheltenham Terrace, S.W. 3.
 Thompson, Rev. E. J., Wesleyan College, Bankura, Bengal.
 Tilley A., 2 Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge.
 Warrington, T. C., High School, Leek, Staffs.
 Waterhouse, Mrs. T. C., Lombeidale Hall, Bakewell.
 Wheeler, Horace L., Public Library, Back Bay, Boston, Mass.
 Wigram, Col Clive, 37 Chester Square, S.W. 1.
 Wollaston, G. H., Flaxley Cottage, Flax Bourton.

† The Ladies' College, Cheltenham.

‡ Queen's University, Belfast.

† Minnesota University.

‡ Princeton University.

* Donors of above 10s. 6d.

† Subscribers for 1921.

‡ Universities, Colleges, or Libraries to which the issues of 1921 will be sent without prepayment.

The secretary should be informed of any error in the above addresses, and of any permanent change of address.

F I N I S

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

S. P. E.

TRACT No. V

THE ENGLISHING OF
FRENCH WORDS

By

Brander Matthews

THE DIALECTAL WORDS IN
BLUNDEN'S POEMS

etc. by

Robert Bridges



At the Clarendon Press

M DCCCC XXI

Oxford University Press

London Edinburgh Glasgow New York
Toronto Melbourne Cape Town Bombay
Humphrey Milford Publisher to the University

FRENCH WORDS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

I

THE English language is an Inn of Strange Meetings where all sorts and conditions of words are assembled. Some are of the bluest blood and of authentic royal descent ; and some are children of the gutter not wise enough to know their own fathers. Some are natives whose ancestors were rooted in the soil since a day whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary ; and some are strangers of outlandish origin, coming to us from all the shores of all the Seven Seas either to tarry awhile and then to depart for ever, unwelcome sojourners only, or to settle down at last and found a family soon asserting equality with the oldest inhabitants of the vocabulary. Seafaring terms came to us from Scandinavia and from the Low Countries. Words of warfare on land crossed the channel, in exchange for words of warfare at sea which migrated from England to France. Dead tongues, Greek and Latin, have been revived to replenish our verbal population with the terms needed for the sciences ; and Italy has sent us a host of words by the fine arts.

The stream of immigrants from the French language has been for almost a thousand years larger than that from any other tongue ; and even to-day it shows little sign of lessening. Of all the strangers within our gates none are more warmly received than those which come to us from across the Straits of Dover. None are more swiftly able to make themselves at home in our dictionaries and to pass themselves off as English. At least, this was the case until comparatively recently, when the process of adoption and assimilation became a little slower and more than a little less satisfactory. Of late French words, even those long domiciled in our lexicons, have been treated almost as if they were still aliens, as if they were here on sufferance, so to speak, as

if they had not become members of the commonwealth. They were allowed to work, no doubt, and sometimes even to be overworked ; but they laboured as foreigners, perhaps even more eagerly employed by the snobbish because they were foreigners and yet held in disrepute by the more fastidious because they were not truly English. That is to say, French words are still as hospitably greeted as ever before, but they are now often ranked as guests only and not as members of the household.

Perhaps this may seem to some a too fanciful presentation of the case. Perhaps it would be simpler to say that until comparatively recently a foreign word taken over into English was made over into an English word, whereas in the past two or three centuries there has been an evident tendency to keep it French and to use it freely while retaining its French pronunciation, its French accents, its French spelling, and its French plural. This tendency is contrary to the former habits of our language. It is dangerous to the purity of English. It forces itself on our attention and it demands serious consideration.

II

In his brief critical biography of Rutebeuf, M. Clédat pointed out that for long years the only important literature in Europe was the French, and that the French language had on three several occasions almost established itself as the language of European civilization—once in the thirteenth century, again in the seventeenth, and finally when Napoleon had made himself temporarily master of the Continent. The earlier universities of Europe were modelled on that of Paris, where Dante had gone to study. Frederick the Great despised his native tongue, spoke it imperfectly, and wrote his unnecessary verses in French. Even now French is only at last losing its status as the accredited tongue of diplomacy.

The French made their language in their own image ; and it is therefore logical, orderly, and clear. Sainte-Beuve declared that a 'philosophical thought has probably not attained all its sharpness and all its illumination until it is expressed in French'. As the French are noted rather for their intelligence than for their imagination, they are the acknowledged masters of prose ; and their achievement in poetry is more disputable. As they are governed by the social instinct, their language exhibits the varied refinements

of a cultivated society where conversation is held in honour as one of the arts. The English speech, like the English-speaking peoples, is bolder, more energetic, more suggestive, and perhaps less precise. From no language could English borrow with more profit to itself than from French; and from no language has it borrowed more abundantly and more persistently. Many of the English words which we can trace to Latin and through Latin to Greek, came to us, not direct from Rome and Athens, but indirectly from Paris. And native French words attain international acceptance almost as easily as do scientific compounds from Greek and Latin. *Phonograph* and *telephone* were not more swiftly taken up than *chassis* and *garage*.

But *chassis* and *garage* still retain their French pronunciation, or perhaps it would be better to say they still receive a pronunciation which is as close an approximation to that of the French as our unpractised tongues can compass. And in thus taking over these French words while striving to preserve their Frenchiness, we are neglectful of our duty, we are imperilling the purity of our own language, and we are deserting the wholesome tradition of English—the tradition which empowered us to take at our convenience but to refashion what we had taken to suit our own linguistic habits.

‘Speaking in general terms,’ Mr. Pearsall Smith writes, in his outline history of the English language, ‘we may say that down to about 1650 the French words that were borrowed were thoroughly naturalized in English, and were made sooner or later to conform to the rules of English pronunciation and accent; while in the later borrowings (unless they have become very popular) an attempt is made to pronounce them in the French fashion.’ From Mr. Smith’s pages it would be easy to select examples of the complete assimilation which was attained centuries ago. *Caitiff*, *canker*, and *carrion* came to us from the Norman dialect of French; and from their present appearance no one but a linguistic expert would suspect their exotic ancestry. *Fury*, *larceny*, *lease*, *embezzle*, *distress*, and *improve* have descended from the jargon of the lawyers who went on thinking in French after they were supposed to be speaking and writing in English. Of equal historical significance are the two series of words which English acquired from the military vocabulary of the French,—the first containing *company*, *regiment*, *battalion*, *brigade*, *division*, and

army ; and the second consisting of *marshal*, *general*, *colonel*, *major*, *captain*, *lieutenant*, *sergeant*, and *corporal*.

(Here I claim the privilege of a parenthesis to remark that in Great Britain *lieutenant* is generally pronounced *leftenant*, than which no anglicization could be more complete, whereas in the United States this officer is called the *lootenant*, which the privates of the American Expeditionary Force in France habitually shortened to 'loot'—except, of course, when they were actually addressing this superior. It may be useful to note, moreover, that while 'colonel' has chosen the spelling of one French form, it has acquired the pronunciation of another)

Dr. Henry Bradley in the *Making of English* provides further evidence of the aforetime primacy of the French in the military art. 'War itself is a Norman-French word, and among the other French words belonging to the same department which became English before the end of the thirteenth century' are *armour*, *assault*, *banner*, *battle*, *fortress*, *lance*, *siege*, *standard*, and *tower*—all of them made citizens of our vocabulary, after having renounced their allegiance to their native land. Another quotation from Dr. Bradley imposes itself. He tells us that the English writers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries felt themselves at liberty to introduce a French word whenever they pleased. 'The innumerable words brought into the language in this way are naturally of the most varied character with regard to meaning. Many of them, which supplied no permanent need of the language, have long been obsolete.'

This second sentence may well give us heart of hope considering the horde of French terms which invaded our tongue in the long years of the Great War. If *camion* and *avion*, *vrille* and *escadrille* supply no permanent need of the language they may soon become obsolete, just as *mitrailleuse* and *franc-tireur* slipped out of sight soon after the end of the Franco-Prussian war of fifty years ago. A French modification of the American 'gatling' was by them called a *mitrailleuse* ; and nowadays we have settled down to the use of *machine-gun*. A *franc-tireur* was an irregular volunteer often incompletely uniformed ; and when he was captured the Prussians shot him as a *guerrilla*. It will be a welcome relief if *camouflage*, as popular five years ago as was *fin-de-siècle* twenty-five years ago, shall follow that now unfashionable vocable into what an American president once described as 'innocuous desuetude'. Perhaps we may

liken *mitrailleuse* and *franc-tireur*, *vrière* and *escadrille*, *brisance* and *rafale*, to the foreign labourers who cross the frontier to aid in the harvest and who return to their own country when the demand for their service is over.

III

The principle which ought to govern can be stated simply. English should be at liberty to help itself freely to every foreign word which seems to fill a want in our own language. It ought to take these words on probation, so to speak, keeping those which prove themselves useful, and casting out those which are idle or rebellious. And then those which are retained ought to become completely English, in pronunciation, in accent, in spelling, and in the formation of their plurals. No doubt this is to-day a counsel of perfection; but it indicates the goal which should be strived for. It is what English was capable of accomplishing prior to the middle of the seventeenth century. It is what English may be able to accomplish in the middle of the twentieth century, if we once awaken to the danger of contaminating our speech with unassimilated words, and to the disgrace, which our stupidity or laziness must bring upon us, of addressing the world in a pudding-stone and piebald language. Dr. Bradley has warned us that 'the pedantry that would bid us reject the word fittest for our purpose because it is not of native origin ought to be strenuously resisted'; and I am sure that he would advocate an equally strenuous resistance to the pedantry which would impose upon us words of alien tongue still clad in foreign uniform.

Mark Twain once remarked that 'everybody talks about the weather and nobody does anything about it'. And many people think that we might as well hope to direct the course of the winds as to order the evolution of our speech. Some words have proved intractable. In the course of the past two centuries and a half, scores and even hundreds of French words have domiciled themselves in English without relinquishing their French characteristics. Consider the sad case of *élite* (which Byron used a hundred years ago), of *encore* (which Steele used two hundred years ago), of *parvenu* (which Gifford used in 1802), of *ennui* (which Evelyn used in 1667), and of *nuance* (which Walpole used in 1781).

No one hesitates to accept these words and to employ

them frequently. *Ennui* and *nuance* are two words which cannot well be spared, but which we are unable to reproduce in our native vocalization. Their French pronunciation is out of the question. What can be done? Can anything be done? We may at least look the facts in the face and govern our own individual conduct by the results of this scrutiny. There is no reason why we should not accept what is a fact; and it is a fact that *ennui* has been adopted. So long ago as 1805 Sidney Smith used it as a verb and said that he had been *ennuied*. Why not therefore frankly and boldly pronounce it as English—*ennuied*? Why not forswear French again and pronounce *nuance* without trying vainly to preserve the Gallic nasalitv of the second n—*new-nance*? And as for a third necessary word, *timbre*. I can only register here my complete concurrence with the opinion expressed in Tract No. 3 of the Society for Pure English—that the ‘English form of the French sound of the word would be approximately *tamber*; and this would be not only a good English-sounding word, like *amber* and *chamber*, but would be like our *tambour*, which is *tympanum*, which again is *timbre*’.

Why should not *séance* (which was used by Charles Lamb in 1803) drop its French accent and take an English pronunciation—*see-ance*? Why should not *garage* and *barrage* rhyme easily with *marriage*? *Marriage* itself came to us from the French; and it sets a good example to these two latest importations. Logic would suggest this, of course; but then logic does not always guide our linguistic practices. And here, again, I am glad to accept another suggestion which I find in Tract No. 3, that *naivety* be recognized and pronounced as an English word, and that ‘a useful word like *malaise* could with advantage reassume the old form “*malease*” which it once possessed’.

I have asked why these thoroughly acclimated French words should not be made to wear our English livery; and to this question Dr. Bradley supplied an answer when he declared that ‘culture is one of the influences which retard the process of simplification’. A man of culture is likely to be familiar with one or more foreign languages; and perhaps he may be a little vain of his intimacy with them. He prefers to give the proper French pronunciation to the words which he recognizes as French; and moreover as the possession of culture, or even of education, does not imply any knowledge of the history of English or of the principles

which govern its growth, the men of culture are often inclined to pride themselves on this pedantic procedure.

It is, perhaps, because the men of culture in the United States are fewer in proportion to the population than American usage is a little more encouraging than the British. Just as we Americans have kept alive not a few old words which have been allowed to drop out of the later vocabulary of the United Kingdom, so we have kept alive—at least to a certain extent—the power of complete assimilation. *Restaurant*, for example, is generally pronounced as though its second syllable rhymed with 'law', and its third with 'pant'. *Trait* is pronounced in accordance with its English spelling, and therefore very few Americans have ever discovered the pun in the title of Dr. Doran's book, 'Table Traits, and something on them'. I think that most Americans rhyme *distract* to 'straight' and not to 'stray'. *Annexe* has become *annex*; *programme* has become *program*—although the longer form is still occasionally seen; and sometimes *coterie* and *reverie* are 'cotery' and 'revery'—in accord with the principle which long ago simplified *phantasie* to *fantasy*. *Charade* like *marmalade* rhymes with *made*. *Brusk* seems to be supplanting *brusque* as *risky* is supplanting *risqué*. *Elite* is spelt without the accent; and it is frequently pronounced *ell-leet*. *Clôture* is rarely to be discovered in American newspapers; *closure* is not uncommon; but the term commonly employed is the purely English 'previous question'.

In the final quarter of the nineteenth century an American adaptation of a French comic opera, 'La Mascotte', was for two or three seasons very popular. The heroine of its story was believed to have the gift of bringing luck. So it is that Americans now call any animal which has been adopted by a racing crew or by an athletic team (or even by a regiment) a *mascot*; and probably not one in ten thousand of those who use the word have any knowledge of its French origin, or any suspicion that it was transformed from the title of a musical play.

I regret, however, to be forced to confess that I have lately been shocked by a piece of petty pedantry which seems to show that we Americans are falling from grace—at least so far as one word is concerned. Probably because many of our architects and decorators have studied in Paris there is a pernicious tendency to call a 'grill' a *grille*. And I have seen with my own eyes, painted on a door in an hotel

grille-room; surely the ultimate abomination of verbal desolation!

I may, however, record to our credit one righteous act—the perfect and satisfactory anglicizing of a Spanish word, whereby we have made 'canyon' out of *cañon*. And I cannot forbear to adduce another word for a fish soup, *chowder*, which the early settlers derived from the French name of the pot in which it was cooked, *chaudière*.¹

IV

As the military vocabulary of English is testimony to the former leadership of the French in the art of war, so the vocabulary of fashion and of gastronomy is evidence of the cosmopolitan primacy of French millinery and French cookery. But most of the military terms were absorbed before the middle of the seventeenth century and were therefore assimilated, whereas the terms of the French dressmaker and of the French cook, chef, or *cordon bleu*, are being for ever multiplied in France and are very rarely being naturalized in English-speaking lands. So far as these two sets of words are concerned the case is probably hopeless, because, if for no other reason, they are more or less in the domain of the gentler sex and we all know that

'A woman, convinced against her will,
Is of the same opinion still.'

The terms of the motor-car, however, and those of the airplane, are in the control of men; and there may be still a chance of bringing about a better state of affairs than now exists. While the war correspondents were actually in France, and while they were often forced to write at top-most speed, there was excuse for *avion* and *cannon*, *vrille* and *escadrille*, and all the other French words which bespattered the columns of British and American, Canadian and Australian newspapers. I doubt if there was ever any necessity for *hangar*, the shed which sheltered the airplane or the airship. *Hangar* is simply the French word for 'shed', no more and no less; it does not indicate specifically a shed for a flying-machine; and as we already had 'shed' we need not take over *hangar*.

When we turn from the gas-engine on wings to the gas-engine on wheels, we find a heterogeneity of words in use

¹ No doubt all these variations of American from British usage will be duly discussed in Professor George Philip Krapp's forthcoming *History of the English Language in America*.

which bear witness to the fact that the French were the first to develop the motor-car, and also to the earlier fact that they had long been renowned for their taste and their skill as coach-builders. As the terminology of the railway in England is derived in part from that of the earlier stage-coach—in the United States, I may interject, it was derived in part from that of the earlier river-steamboat—so the terminology of the motor-car in France was derived in part from that of the pleasure-carriage. So we have the *landaulet* and *limousine* to designate different types of body. I think *landaulet* had already acquired an English pronunciation; at least I infer this because I cannot now recall that I ever heard it fall from the lips of an English-speaking person with its original French pronunciation of the nasal *n*. And *limousine*, being without accent and without nasal *n* can be trusted to take care of itself.

There are other technical terms of the motor-car industry which present more difficult problems. *Tonneau* is not troublesome, even if its spelling is awkward. There is *chauffeur* first of all; and I wish that it might generally acquire the local pronunciation it is said to have in Norfolk—*shover*. Then there is *chassis*. Is this the exact equivalent of ‘running gear’? Is there any available substitute for the French word? And if *chassis* is to impose itself, from sheer necessity what is to be done with it? Our forefathers boldly cut down *chaise* to ‘shay’—at least my forefathers did it in New England, long before Oliver Wendell Holmes commemorated their victory over the alien in the ‘Deacon’s Masterpiece’, more popularly known as the ‘One Horse Shay’. And the men of old were even bolder when they curtailed *cabriolet* to ‘cab’, just as their children have more recently and with equal courage shortened ‘taximeter vehicle’ to ‘taxi’, and ‘automobile’ itself to ‘auto’. Unfortunately it is not possible to cut the tail off *chassis*, or even to cut the head off, as the men of old did with ‘wig’, originally ‘periwig’, which was itself only a daring and summary anglicization of *peruke*.

Due to the fact that the drama has been more continuously alive in the literature of France than in that of any other country, and due also, it may be, to the associated fact that the French have been more loyally devoted to the theatre than any other people, the vocabulary of the English-speaking stage has probably more unassimilated French words than we can discover in the vocabulary of

any of our other activities. We are none of us surprised when we find in our newspaper criticisms *artiste*, *ballet*, *conservatoire*, *comédienne*, *costumier*, *danseuse*, *début*, *dévoûment*, *diseuse*, *encore*, *ingénue*, *mise-en-scène*, *perruquier*, *pianiste*, *première*, *répertoire*, *revue*, *rôle*, *tragédienne*—the catalogue stretches out to the crack of doom.

Long as the list is, the words on it demand discussion. As to *rôle* I need say nothing since it has been considered carefully in Tract No. 3; I may merely mention that it appeared in English at least as early as 1606, so that it has had three centuries to make itself at home in our tongue. *Conservatoire* and *répertoire* have seemingly driven out the English words, which were long ago made out of them, 'conservatory' and 'repertory'. What is the accepted pronunciation of *ballet*? Is it *bal-leet* or *ballay* or *bally*? (If it is *bally*, it has a recently invented cockney homophone.) For *costumier* and *perruquier* I can see no excuse whatever; although I have observed them frequently on London play-bills, I am delighted to be able to say that they do not disgrace the New York programmes, which mention the 'costumer' and the 'wigmaker'. 'Encore' was used by Steele in 1712: it was early made into an English verb; and yet I have heard the verb pronounced with the nasal *n* of the original French. Here is another instance of English taking over a French word and giving it a meaning not acceptable in Paris, where the playgoers do not *encore*, they *bis*.

Why should we call a nondescript medley of dialogue and dance and song a *revue*, when *revue* in French is the exact equivalent of 'review' in English? Why should we call an actress of comic characters a *comédienne* and an actress of tragic characters a *tragédienne*, when we do not call a comic actor a *comédien* or a tragic actor a *tragédien*? Possibly it is because 'comedian' and 'tragedian' seem to be too exclusively masculine—so that a want is felt for words to indicate a female tragedian and a female comedian. Probably it is for the same reason that a male dancer is not termed a *danseur* while a female dancer is termed a *danseuse*. Then there is *diseuse*, apparently reserved for the lady who recites verse, no name being needed apparently for the gentleman who recites verse—at least, I am reasonably certain that I have never seen *diseur* applied to any male reciter.

Mise-en-scène is another of the French terms which has

suffered a Channel-change. In Paris it means the arrangement of the stage-business, whereas in London and in New York it is employed rather to indicate the elaboration of the scenery and of the spectacular accessories. An even more extraordinary misadventure has befallen *pianiste*, in that it is sometimes used as if it was to be applied only to a female performer. And this blunder is of long standing; but I remember as lately as forty years ago seeing an American advertisement of Teresa Carreño which proclaimed her to be 'the greatest living *lady pianiste*'. I have also detected evidences of a startling belief of the illiterate that *artiste* is the feminine of 'artist'. Nevertheless I found recently in a volume caricaturing the chief performers of the London music-halls a foot-note which explained that these celebrities were therein entitled *artistes*,—because 'an artist creates, an *artiste* performs'.

Still to be analysed are *première* for 'first performance' or 'opening night' and *début* for 'first appearance'; and I fear that it is beyond expectation that these alien words will speedily drop their alien accents and their alien pronunciations. The same must be said also of *dénouement* and of *ingénue*—French words which really fill a gap in our vocabulary and which are none the less abhorrent to our speech habits. The most that is likely to happen is that they may shed their accents and more or less approximate an English pronunciation, *dee-noo-meant*, perhaps, and *inn-je-new*, an approximation which will be sternly resisted by the literate. I well remember one occasion when I overheard scorn poured upon a charming American actress who had happened to mention the date of her own *debut* in New York.

V

Encore and *mise-en-scène* are only two of a dozen or a score of French words not infrequently used in English and misused by being charged with meanings not strictly in accord with French usage. 'Levee' is one; the French say *lever*. *Nom de plume* is another; the French say *nom de guerre*. *Musicale* also is rarely, if ever, to be found in French, at least I believe it to be the custom in Paris to call an 'evening with music' a *soirée musicale*. If *musicale* is too serviceable to demand banishment, why should it not drop the *e* and become *musical*? When Theodore Roosevelt, always as exact as he was vigorous in his use of

language, was President of the United States, the cards of invitation which went out from the White House bore 'musical' in one of their lower corners; so that the word, if not the King's English, is the President's English.

To offset this I must record with regret that the late Clyde Fitch once wrote a one-act play about a manicurist, and as this operator on the finger-nails was a woman he entitled his playlet, the *Manicuriste*; and he did this in spite of the fact that, as a writer fairly familiar with French, he ought to have known the proper term—*manucure*.

Then there is *double-entendre*, implying a secondary meaning of doubtful delicacy. Dryden used it in 1673, when it was apparently good French, although it has latterly been superseded in France by *double-entente*—which has not, however, the somewhat sinister suggestion we attach to *double-entendre*. I noted it in Trench's 'Calderon' (in the 1880 reprint), and also in Thackeray; and both Calderon and Thackeray were competent French scholars.

Perhaps this is as good a place as any to consider *née*, put after the name of a married woman and before the family name of her father. The Germans have a corresponding usage, *Frau Schmidt, geboren Braun*. There is no doubt that *née* is convenient, and there is little doubt that it would be difficult to persuade the men of culture to surrender it or even to translate it. To the literate 'Mrs. Smith, born Brown', might seem discourteously abrupt. But the French word is awkward, nevertheless, since the illiterate often take it as meaning only 'formerly', writing 'Mrs. Smith, *née* Mary Brown', which implies that this lady had been christened before she was born. And there is a tale of a profiteer's wife who wrote herself down as 'Mrs. John Smith, New York, *née* Chicago'.

Yet the French themselves are not always scrupulous to follow *née* with only the family name of the lady. No less a scholar than Gaston Paris dedicated his *Poètes et Pensateurs* to 'Madame James Darmesteter, *née* Mary Robinson'. Perhaps this is an instance of the modification of the strict meaning of a word by convention because of its enlarged usefulness when so modified.

Gaston Paris must be allowed all the rights and privileges of a master of language; but his is a dangerous example for the unscholarly, who are congenitally careless and who are responsible for *soubriquet* instead of *sobriquet*, for *à l'outrance* instead of *à outrance*, and for *en déshabille* instead

of *en déshabillé*. The late Mrs. Oliphant in her little book on Sheridan credited him with *gaieté du cœur*. It was long an American habit to term a railway station a *dépot* (totally anglicized in its pronunciation—*decp-oh*); but *dépot* is in French the name for a storehouse, and it is not—or not customarily—the name of a railway station. It was also a custom in American theatres to give the name of ‘*parquette-seats*’ to the chairs which are known in England as ‘stalls’; and in village theatres *parquette* was generally pronounced ‘par-kay’.

There are probably as many in Great Britain as in the United States who speak the French which is not spoken by the French themselves. Affectation and pretentiousness and the desire to show off are abundant in all countries. They manifest themselves even in Paris, where I once discovered on a bill of fare at the Grand Hotel *Irisch-stew à la françoise*. This may be companioned by a bill of fare on a Cunard steamer plying between Liverpool and New York, whereon I found myself authorized to order *tartlettes* and *cutlettes*. When I called the attention of a neighbour to these outlandish vocables, the affable steward bent forward to enlighten my ignorance. ‘It’s the French, sir,’ he explained; ‘*tartlete* and *cutlete* is French.’

That way danger lies; and when we are speaking or writing to those who have English as their mother-tongue there are obvious advantages in speaking and writing English, with no vain effort to capture Gallic graces. Readers of Mark Twain’s *Tramp Abroad* will recall the scathing rebuke which the author administered to his agent, Harris, because a report which Harris had submitted was peppered, not only with French and German words, but also with savage plunder from Choctaw and Feejee and Eskimo. Harris explained that he intruded these hostile verbs and nouns to adorn his page, and justified himself by saying that ‘they all do it. Everybody that writes elegantly’. Whereupon Mark Twain, whose own English was as pure as it was rich and flexible, promptly read Harris a needed lesson: ‘A man who writes a book for the general public to read is not justified in disfiguring his pages with untranslated foreign expressions. It is an insolence toward the majority of the purchasers, for it is a very frank and impudent way of saying, “Get the translations made yourselves if you want it—this book is not written for the ignorant classes” . . . The writer would say that he

uses the foreign language where the delicacy of his point cannot be conveyed in English. Very well, then, he writes his best things for the tenth man, and he ought to warn the other nine not to buy his book.'

The result of these straight-forward and out-spoken remarks is set forth by Mark Twain himself: 'When the musing spider steps upon the red-hot shovel, he first exhibits a wild surprise, then he shrivels up. Similar was the effect of these blistering words upon the tranquil and unsuspecting agent. I can be dreadfully rough on a person when the mood takes me.'

VI

This sermon might have been made even broader in its application. It is not always only the ignorant who are discommoded by a misguided reliance on foreign words as bestowers of elegance; it is often the man of culture, aware of the meaning of the alien vocable but none the less jarred by its obtrusion on an English page. The man of culture may have his attention disturbed even by a foreign word which has long been acclimatized in English, if it still retains its unfriendly appearance. I suppose that *savan* has established its citizenship in our vocabulary; it is, at least, domiciled in our dictionaries¹; but when I found it repeated by Frederic Myers, in *Science and a Future Life*, to avoid the use of 'scientist', the French word forced itself on me, and I found myself reviving a boyish memory of a passage in Abbott's *Life of Napoleon* dealing with Bonaparte's expedition to Egypt and narrating the attacks of the Mamelukes, when the order was given to form squares with '*savans* and asses in the center'.

An otherwise fine passage of Ruskin's has always been spoilt for me by the wilful incursion of two French words, which seem to me to break the continuity of the sentence: 'A well-educated gentleman may not know many languages; may not be able to speak any but his own; may have read very few books. But whatever language he knows, he knows precisely; whatever word he pronounces, he pronounces rightly; above all, he is learned in the peerage of words; knows the words of true descent and ancient blood at a glance from words of modern *canaille*;

¹ *Savan* is quite obsolete in British use, and is not in the *Century Dictionary* or in Webster, 1911. *Savant* is common, and often written without italics, but the pronunciation is never anglicized.—H.B.

remembers all their ancestry, their intermarriages, distantest relationships, and the extent to which they were admitted, and offices they hold, among the national *noblesse* of words, at any time and in any country.' Are not *canaille* and *noblesse* distracting? Do they not interrupt the flow? Do they not violate what Herbert Spencer aptly called the Principle of Economy of Attention, which he found to be the basis of all the rules of rhetoric?

Since I have made one quotation from Ruskin, I am emboldened to make two from Spencer, well known as his essay on 'Style' ought to be:—'A reader or listener has at each moment but a limited amount of mental power available. To recognize and interpret the symbols presented to him, requires part of his power; to arrange and combine the images suggested requires a further part; and only that part which remains can be used for realizing the thought conveyed. Hence, the more time and attention it takes to receive and understand each sentence, the less time and attention can be given to the contained idea; and the less vividly will that idea be conceived.'—'Carrying out the metaphor that language is the vehicle of thought, there seems reason to think that in all cases the friction and inertia of the vehicle deduct from its efficiency; and that in composition, the chief, if not the sole thing to be done, is to reduce this friction and inertia to the smallest possible amount.'

Savan and *canaille* and *noblesse* may be English words; but they have not that appearance. They have not rooted themselves in English earth as *war* has, for instance, and *cab* and *wig*. To me, for one, they increase the friction and the inertia; and yet, of course, the words themselves are not strange to me; they seem to me merely out of place and in the way. I can easily understand why Myers and Ruskin wanted them, even needed them. It was because they carried a meaning not easily borne by more obvious and more hackneyed nouns. 'The words of our mother tongue', said Lowell in his presidential address to the Modern Language Association of America, 'have been worn smooth by so often rubbing against our lips and our minds, while the alien word has all the subtle emphasis and beauty of some new-minted coin of ancient Syracuse. In our critical estimates we should be on our guard against its charm.'

Since I have summoned myself as a witness I take the stand once more to confess that Alan Seeger's lofty lyric,

'I have a rendezvous with Death' has a diminished appeal because of the foreign connotations of 'rendezvous'. The French noun was adopted into English more than three centuries ago; and it was used as a verb nearly three centuries ago; it does not interfere with the current of sympathy when I find it in the prose of Scott and of Mark Twain. Nevertheless, it appears to me unfortunate in Seeger's noble poem, where it forces me to taste its foreign flavour.

Another French word, *bouquet*, is indisputably English; and yet when I find it in Walt Whitman's heartfelt lament for Lincoln, 'O Captain, my Captain', I cannot but feel it to be a blemish:—

'For you *bouquets* and ribbon'd wreaths—for you the shore's
a-crowding,

For you they call, the swaying mass, their eager faces turning.'

It may be hypercriticism on my part, but *bouquet* strikes me as sadly infelicitous; and a large part of its infelicity is due to its having kept its French spelling and its French pronunciation. It is not in keeping; it diverts the flow of feeling; it is almost indecorous—much as a quotation from Voltaire in the original might be indecorous in a funeral address delivered by an Anglican bishop in a cathedral.

VII

There are several questions which writers and speakers who give thought to their expressions will do well to ask themselves when they are tempted to employ a French word or indeed a word from any alien tongue. The first is the simplest: Is the foreign word really needed? For example, there is no benefit in borrowing *impasse* when there exists already in English its exact equivalent, 'blind-alley', which carries the meaning more effectively even to the small percentage of readers or listeners who are familiar with French. Nor is there any gain in *résumé* when 'summary' and 'synopsis' and 'abstract' are all available.

The second question is perhaps not quite so simple: Is the French word one which English has already accepted and made its own? We do not really need *questionnaire*, since we have 'interrogatory', but if we want it we can make shift with 'questionary'; and for *concessionnaire* we can put 'concessionary'. To balance 'employer' there is 'employee', better by far than *employé*, which insists on a

French pronunciation. Matthew Arnold and Lowell, always apt and exact in their use of their own tongue, were careful to prefer the English 'technic' to the French *technique*, which is not in harmony with the adjectives 'technical' and *polytechnic*. So 'clinic' seems at last to have vanquished its French father *clinique*, as 'fillet' has superseded *filet*; and now that 'valet' has become a verb it has taken on an English pronunciation.

Then there is *littérateur*. If a synonym for 'man of letters' is demanded why not find it in 'literator', which Lockhart did not hesitate to employ in the *Life of Scott*. It is pleasant to believe that *communard*, which was prevalent fifty years ago after the burning of the Tuilleries, has been succeeded by 'communist' and that its twin-brother *dynamitard* is now rarely seen and even more rarely heard. Perhaps some of the credit may be due to Stevenson, who entitled his tale the *Dynamiter* and appended a foot-note declaring that 'any writard who writes *dynamitard* shall find in me a never-resting fightard'.

The third question may call for a little more consideration: Has the foreign word been employed so often that it has ceased to be foreign even though it has not been satisfactorily anglicized in spelling and pronunciation? In the *Jungle Book* Mr. Kipling introduces an official who is in charge of the 'reboisement' of India; and in view of the author's scrupulosity in dealing with professional vocabularies we may assume that this word is a recognized technical term, equivalent to the older word 'afforestation'. What is at once noteworthy and praiseworthy is that in Mr. Kipling's page it does not appear in italics. And in Mr. Pearsall Smith's book on the English language one admiring reader was pleased to find 'débris' also without italics, although with the retention of the French accent. Perhaps the time is not far distant when the best writers will cease to stigmatize a captured word with the italics which are a badge of servitude and which proclaim that it has not yet been enfranchised into our language.

The fourth question is the most perplexing: If the formerly foreign word has been taken over and if it can therefore be utilized without hesitancy, can it be made to form its plural in accord with the customs of English. Here those who seek to make the English language truly English and to keep it truly pure, will meet with sturdy resistance. It will not be easy to persuade the literate, the men of

culture, to renounce the *x* at the end of *beaux* and *bureaux* and to spell these plurals 'beaus' and 'bureaus'. And yet no one doubts that 'beau' and 'bureau' have both won the right to be regarded as having attained an honourable standing in our language.

VIII

'De Quincey once said that authors are a dangerous class for any language'—so Professor Krapp has reminded us in his book on *Modern English*, and he has explained that De Quincey meant 'that the literary habit of mind is likely to prove dangerous for a language . . . because it so often leads a speaker or writer to distrust natural and unconscious habit, even when it is right, and to put in its stead some conscious theory of literary propriety. Such a tendency, however, is directly opposed to the true feeling for idiomatic English. It destroys the sense of security, the assurance of perfect congruity between thought and expression, which the unliterary and unacademic speaker and writer often has, and which, with both literary and unliterary, is the basis for all expressive use of language'.

And since I have borrowed the quotation from Professor Krapp I shall bring this rambling paper to an end by borrowing another, from the *Toxophilus* of Roger Ascham (1545).

'He that will wryte well in any tongue must folowe this council of Aristotle, to speake as the common people do, to think as wise men do. Many English writers have not done so, but using straunge wordes as latin, french, and Italian, do make all things darke and harde. Once I communed with a man whiche reasoned the englyshe tongue to be enryched and encreased thereby, sayinge—Who wyll not prayse that feaste where a man shall drinke at a diner bothe wyne, ale and beere? Truly, quod I they all be good, every one taken by hym selfe alone, but if you put Malmesye and sacke, read wine and whyte, ale and beere, and al in one pot, you shall make a drynke neyther easie to be knownen nor yet holsom for the body.'

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

NOTES

The word *laches*, which is not noticed in the above paper, is one of a list of words sent to us by a correspondent who suggests that it is the business of our society to direct the public as to their pronunciation. Like other examples given by Mr. Matthews, *laches* seems to be at present in an uncertain condition ; and as it is used only by lawyers they will be able to decide its future. What seems clear about it is that the two contending pronunciations are homophones, one with *latches* the other with *lashes*. The A having been Englished its closing T seems natural ; and *latches* (from *lachesse*) is thus an exact parallel with *riches* (from *richesse*). But there seems no propriety in the SS being changed to Z. The pronunciation *latchess* would save it from its awkward and absurd homophone *lashes*, and would be in order with *prowess*, *largess*, *noblesse*, &c. Moreover, since *laches* is used only as the name of a quality (=negligence) and never (like *riches*), as a plural, to connote special acts of negligence, the pronunciation *latchess* would be correct as well as convenient : and the word would be better spelt with double S : *lachess*.

Of the word *levee* the *O.E.D.* says, 'All our verse quotations place the stress on the first syllable. In England this is the court pronunciation, and prevails in educated use. The pronunciation' with the accent on the second syllable 'which is given by Walker, is occasionally heard in Great Britain, and appears to be generally preferred in the U. S.', but the dictionary does not quote Burns

'Guid-mornin' to your Majesty !
May Heav'n augment your blisses,
On ev'ry new birthday ye see,
A humble poet wishes !
My bardship here, at your levee,
On sic a day as this is,
Is sure an uncouth sight to see,
Amang thae birthday dresses
Sae fine this day.'

So that it would seem that the Scotch and American pronunciation of this word is more thoroughly Englished than our own : and the prejudice which opposes straightforward common-sense solutions, however desirable they may be, is brought home to us by the fact that almost all Englishmen would be equally shocked by the notion either of spelling this word as they pronounce it, *levee*, or of pronouncing it like Burns, as they spell it, *levee*.

ENGLISH WORDS IN FRENCH

It would be instructive if we could give a parallel account of what the French do when they adopt an English word into their language. *Le Dictionnaire des Anglicismes*, lately published by Delagrave, has two hundred pages, and is much praised by a reviewer in the *Mercure de France*, Feb. 15, p. 246: but it does not give the current French pronunciations of the English words. The reviewer writes: 'Ce qui me gène bien davantage, c'est que M. Bonnaffé supprime, partout, avec rigueur, la façon française de prononcer le mot anglais. Était-il superflu de dire comment nous articulons *shampooing*? Nous n'avons, je crois, qu'une forme orale pour *boy*, petit domestique, parce qu'il est dû à l'oreille; mais nous sommes partagés quant à *boy-scout*, qui est arrivé par tracts et par journaux. L'anglais donne un mot *high-life*, le français en fait cinq: *haylayf*, *aïläif*, *ichlif*, *ijlif*, *iglif*.' p. 247. It would seem from *high-life* that English words in French sometimes look as strange as French words do when represented in make-shift English phonetics. On p. 228 of the same *Mercure* there is notice of 'un petit manuel de conversation' in which 'Toutes les nuances de la "phonetic pronunciation" sont notées, à l'usage des Américains désireux de se faire comprendre en français. Cette notation (says the reviewer) m'a tellement amusé que je ne puis résister au plaisir d'en citer quelques exemples: Av-nü' day Shawn Zay-lec-zay', Plass de la Kown-kord' to Plass der lay-twal. Fown-ten day Zeen-noh-sawn, — Oh-pay-râ Kum-meek, — Foh-lee Bair-zhair, — Bool-vâr day Kâ-pu-seen, — Beeb-lee-oh-tech Sant Zhun-vec-ayv', — Lay Zan-vâ-iced, — May-zown' der Veck-tor' U-goh', — Hub-bay-leesk', — Rü San Tawn-twan, &c., &c....' There would seem to be errors in this 'citation'. Vecktor should be VEEKtor? and H looks like a misprint for L in Hub-bay-leesk. -tech was probably -teck. Bonnaffé's book is noticed in *The Modern Language Review* of last January.

ON THE DIALECTAL WORDS IN EDMUND BLUNDEN'S POEMS¹

IN the original prospectus of the S. P. E., reprinted in Tract I, and again in III. p. 9, one of the objects of the Society is stated to be the 'enrichment and what is called regeneration of the language from the picturesque vocabularies of local vernaculars'. Since a young poet, Mr. Edmund Blunden, has lately published a volume in which this particular element of dialectal and obsolescent words is very prominent, it will be suitable to our general purpose to consider it as a practical experiment and examine the results. The poetic diction and high standard of his best work give sufficient importance to this procedure; and though he may seem to be somewhat extravagant in his predilection for unusual terms, yet his poetry cannot be imagined without them, and the strength and beauty of the effects must be estimated in his successes and not in his failures.

In the following remarks no appreciation of the poetry will be attempted: our undertaking is merely to tabulate the 'new' words, and examine their fitness for their employment. The bracketed numbers following the quotations give the page of the book where they occur. The initials *O. E. D.* and *E. D. D.* stand for the *Oxford English Dictionary* and the *English Dialect Dictionary* (Wight).

i. 'And churning owls and goistering daws'. (1)

Here *churning* is a mistake; we are sorry to begin with an animadversion, but the word should be *churring*. *Churr* is an echo-word, and though there may be examples of echo-words which have been bettered by losing all trace of their simple spontaneous origin, this is not one. It is like *burr*, *purr*, and *whirr*; and these words are best spelt with double R and the R should be trilled. The absurdity of

¹ *The Waggoner and other Poems*, by Edmund Blunden, pp. 50. Sidgwick and Jackson. London, 1920.

not trilling this final R is seen very plainly in *burr*, because that word's definition is 'a rough sounding of the letter R.' This is not represented by the pronunciation bo:. What that 'southern English' pronunciation does indicate is the vulgarity and inconvenience of its degradations. *Burr* occurs in these poems.

'There the live dimness burrs with droning glees'. (23)

Burr is, moreover, a bad homophone and cannot neglect possible distinctions: the Oxford Dictionary has eight entries of substantives under *burr*.

Our author also uses *whirr*:

'And the bleak garrets' crevices
Like whirring distaffs utter dread', (26)

and again of the noise of wind in ivy, on p. 54, and

'The damp gust makes the ivy whirr', (48)

whirr rhyming here with *executioner*.

Since *churring* (in the first quotation) would automatically preserve its essential trill, the intruder *churning* is the more obnoxious; and unless the R can be trilled it would seem better for poets to use only the inflected forms of these words, and prefer *churreth* to *churrs*.

If *churn* is anywhere dialectal for *churr*, it must have come from the common mistake of substituting a familiar for an unknown word: and this is the worst way of making homophones.

2. 'goistering daws'.

Goister or *gauster* is a common dialect verb; the latter form seems the more common and is recognized in the Oxford Dictionary, where it is defined 'to behave in a noisy boisterous fashion... in some localities to laugh noisily'. If jackdaws are to appropriate a word to describe their behaviour, no word could be better than *goistering*, and we prefer *goister* to *gauster*. Its likeness to *boisterous* will assist it, and we guess that it will be accepted. In the little glossary at the end of the book *goistering* is explained as *guffawing*. That word is not so descriptive of the jackdaw, since it suggests 'coarse bursts of laughter', and the coarseness is absent from the fussy vulgarity and mere needless jabber of the daw.

3. 'A dor flew by with crackling cry'. (7)
This to the ear is

'A daw flew by with crackling cry' ;

and though our poet's glossary tells us that *dor*=*dor-hawk* or *nightjar*, it really is not so. A *dor* is a beetle so called from its making a *dorrining* noise, and the name, like *churr* and *burr*, is better with its double R and trill. *Dor-hawk* may be a name for the *nightjar*, but properly *dorr* is not ; and if it were, it would be forbidden by *daw* so long as it neglected its trill. Note also the misfortune that four lines below we read

'The pigeons flaunted round his door',

where the full correct pronunciation of *door* (dɔə*) will not quite protect it. The whole line quoted from p. 7 is obscure, because a *nightjar* would never be recognized by the description of a bird that utters a crackling cry when flying. That it then makes a sound different from its distinctive whirring note is recorded. T. A. Coward writes 'when on the wing it has a soft call co-ic, and a sharper and repeated alarm quik, quik, quik.' It is doubtful whether *crackling* can be accepted.

4. 'The grumping miller picked his way'. (8)

Grumping is a good word, which appears from the dictionaries to be a common-speech term that is picking its way into literature.

5. 'The golden nobs and pippens swell'. (12)

nob is *knob*. *Golden-nob* is 'a variety of apple'; see *E.D.D.* : and as a special name, which the passage implies, it should be hyphenated.

6. 'where the pollards frown.

Notched, dumb, surly images of pain'. (13)

Notched. This word well describes the appearance of old pollard willows after they have been cropped ; but its full propriety may escape notice. A very early use of the verb *to notch* was to cut or crop the hair roughly, and *notched* was so used. The Oxford Dictionary quotes Lamb, 'a notched and cropt scrivener'. Then *pollard* itself is from *poll*, and means an animal that has lost its horns as well as a tree that has been 'pollarded'.

7. 'In elver-peopled crevices'. (19)

We are grateful for *elver*. This form has carefully differentiated itself from *eel-fare*, which means the passage of the young eels up the rivers, and has come to mean the *eel-fry* themselves.

8. 'For Sussex cries from primrose lags and breaks'. (22)

E.D.D., among many meanings of *lag*, explains this as a Sussex and Somerset term for 'a long marshy meadow usually by the side of a stream'. Since the word seems as if it might be used for anything somewhere, we cannot question its title to these meadows, but we doubt its power to retain possession, except in some favoured locality.

9. 'And chancing lights on willowy waterbreaks'. (22)

We have to guess what a *waterbreak* is, having found no other example of the word.

10. 'Of hobby-horses with their starting eyes'. (23)

Hobby-horse as a local or rustic name for dragon-fly can have no right to general acceptance.

11. 'Stolchy ploughlands hid in grief'. (24)

Stolchy is so good a word that it does not need a dictionary. Wright gives only the verb *stolch* 'to tread down, trample, to walk in the dirt'. The adjective is therefore primarily applicable to wet land that has become sodden and miry by being *poached* by cattle, and then to any ground in a similar condition. Since *poach* is a somewhat confused homophone, its adjective *poachy* has no chance against *stolchy*.

12. 'I whirry through the dark'. (24)

Whirry is another word that explains itself, and perhaps the more readily for its confusion (in this sense) with *worry*, see *E.D.D.* where it is given as adjective and verb, the latter used by Scott in 'Midlothian'. 'Her and the gude-man will be whirrying through the blue lift on a broom-shank.' In the *Century Dictionary*, with its pronunciation *hwér'i*, it is described as dialectal form of *whirr* or of *hurry*, to fly rapidly with noise, also transitive to hurry.

13. 'No hedger brished nor scythesman swung'. (25)

and

'The morning hedger with his brishing-hook'. (62)

These two lines explain the word *brish*. *O.E.D.* gives *brish* as dialectal of *brush*, and so *E.D.D.* has the verb *to brush* as dialect for trimming a tree or hedge. *Brush* is a difficult homophone, and it would be useful to have one of its derivative meanings separated off as *brish*.

14. 'A hizzing dragonfly that daps
Above his muddled pond'. (28)

Hizzing is an old word now neglected. Shakespeare has

'To have a thousand with red burning spits
Come hizzing in upon 'em'.—*Lear*, III. vi. 17.

and there are other quotations in *O.E.D.*

15. *Dap* is used again, 'the dapping moth'. (45.) This word is well known to fishermen and fowlers, meaning 'to dip lightly and suddenly into water' but is uncommon in literature.

16. 'The glinzy ice grows thicker through'. (28)

Author's glossary explains *glinzy* as slippery. *E.D.D.* gives this word as *glincey* and derives from French *glincer* as *glasser*, to slide or glide. *Glinzy* and *glincey* carry unavoidable suggestion of *glint*. Compare the words in No. 15. *Glossery* would be convincing.

17. 'The green east hagged with prowling storm'. (30)

In *O.E.D.* *hagged* is given as monopolized by the sense of 'bewitched', or of 'lean and gaunt', related to *haggard*. This does not suit. The intention is probably an independent use of the p.p. of the transitive verb 'to hag'; defined as 'to torment or terrify as a hag, to trouble as the nightmare'.

18. 'where with the browsing thaive'. (31)

Thaive is a two-year-old ewe. Wright gives *theave* or *theeve* as the commoner forms, and in the Paston letters it is *theyve*, which perhaps confirms *thaive*, rhymed here with 'rave'. Certainly it is most advisable to avoid *thieves*, the plural of thief, although *O.E.D.* allows this pronunciation and indeed puts it first of the alternatives.

19. 'On the pathway side . . . the glinting flint'. (32)

O.E.D. gives *glimter* as a 'rare' word. We have *glimting*, *glistening*, *glittering*, and *glistering*, and Scotch *glisting*.

20. 'The wind tangs through the shattered pane'. (34)

Echo-words, like ting-tang, ding-dong, &c., must have their liberty; but of *tang* it should be noted that, though the verb may raise no inconvenience, yet the substantive has a very old and well-established use in the sense of a projecting point or barb (especially of metal), or sting, and that this demands respect and recognition. It is something less than prong, and is the proper word for the metal point that fixes the strap of a buckle. The homophonic ambiguity is notorious in Shakespeare's

'She had a tongue with a tang',

where, as the *O.E.D.* suggests, the double sense of sting and ring were perhaps intended.

21. 'The grutching pixies hedge me round'. (37)

Grudge and *grutch* are the same word. The use of the obsolete form would therefore be fanciful if there were no difference in the sense; but there is a useful distinction: because *grudge* has entirely lost its original sense of murmuring, making complaint, and is confined to the consciousness and feeling of discontent, whereas *grutch* is recognized as carrying the old meaning of grumble. Thus Stevenson as quoted in *O.E.D.*, 'The rest is grunting and grutching'. It is a very useful word to restore, but it may, perhaps, at this particular time find *grouse* rather strongly entrenched.

22. 'Where the channering insect channels'. (46)

This is, of course, our old friend

The cock doth craw, the day doth daw,
The channerin' worm doth chide',

and it looks like an attempt to define what is there meant, viz. that the worm made a channering noise in burrowing through the wood. The notion is perhaps admissible, though we cannot believe the sound to be audible.

23. 'The lispering aspens'. (53)

Lispering. We should be grateful for this word. *O.E.D.* quotes it from Clare's poems.

24. 'Of shallows with the shealings chalky white'. (64)

Sheal is a homophone. 1. a shepherd's hut or shanty; 2. a peascod or seed-shell. Of the first, *shiel* and *shieling* are common forms; the second is dialectal; *E.D.D.* gives

shealing as the husk of seeds. If this be the meaning in our quotation, the appearance described is unrecognized by the present annotator.

25. 'Dull streams
Flow flagging in the undescribed deep fourms
Of creatures born the first of all, long dead'. (67)

Fourm, explained as a 'hare's lurking place', commonly called *form*, widely used and understood because the lair has the shape or form of the animal that lay in it. But perhaps it was originally only the animal's seat or form, as we use the word in schools. *Form* has so many derivative senses that it would be an advantage to have this one thus differentiated both in spelling and sound.

26. 'Toadstools twired and hued fantastically'. (68)

Though the word *twired* is not explained in Mr. Blunden's glossary and the meaning is not evident from the context, we guess that he is using it here of shape, in the sense of 'contorted', which would range with the quotation from Burton (given in some dictionaries) 'No sooner doth a young man see his sweetheart coming, but he... slickes his haire, twires his beard [&c.]'. Here *twires*, as latest edition of *O.E.D.* suggests, may be a misprint for *twirls*. Older dictionaries give wrong and misleading definitions of this word; and a spurious *twire*, to sing, was inferred from a misreading 'twierethe' for 'twitereth' in Chaucer's *Boethius*, III m. 2. Modern authorities only allow *twire*, to peep, as in Shakespeare's 28th Sonnet,

'When sparkling stars twire not, thou gildst the even'
(whence some had foolishly supposed that *twire* meant twinkle) and in Ben Jonson, *Sad Shepherd*, II. 1, 'Which maids will twire at, 'tween their fingers'. The verb is still in dialectal use: *E.D.D.* explains it 'to gaze wistfully or beseechingly'.

27. 'The tiny frogs
Go yerking'. (69)

Yerk. The intrans. verb is to kick as a horse. The trans. verb is quoted from Massinger, Herrick, and Burns, who has 'My fancy yerkit up sublime': i. e. roused, lashed.

28. 'There seems no heart in wood or wide'. (8)

Wide as a subst. is hardly recognized. Tennyson is quoted, 'The waste wide of that abyss', but as *waste* is a recognized substantive the authority is uncertain.

In the above examples we have taken such words as best answered our purpose, neglecting many which have almost equal claims. The richness of the vocabulary in unusual words and in words carrying unusual meanings forbids complete examination; as will be seen by a rough classification of some of those which we have passed over.

To begin with the words which our author uses well, we will quote as an example all the passages in which *writhe* occurs. The transitive verb which is perhaps in danger of neglect is very valuable, and it is well employed. These passages will also fully exhibit the general quality of Mr. Blunden's diction.

'But no one loves the aguish mist
That writhes its way at eventide
Along the copse's waterside'. (3)

'But now the sower's hand is writhed
In livid death'. (25)

'To-morrow's brindled shouting storms with flood
The purblind hollows with a leaden rain
And flat the gleanings-fields to choking mud
And writhe the groaning woods with bursts of pain'. (42)

'The lispering aspens and the scarf'd brook-grasses
With wakened melancholy writhe the air'. (53)

Dimpling is well and poetically used in

'While the woodlark's dimpling rings
In the dim air climb'. (21)

and also *quag* (verb) (2), *seething* (3), *channelled* (9), *bunch* (11), *jungled* (11), *rout* (verb) (12), *fluster* (13), *byre* (13), *plash* (shallow water) (19), *tantalise* (neut. v.) (36), *hatched* (43), *flounce* (44), *rootle* (45), *shore* (verb) (59). *Lair* (verb) (43) does not seem a useful word.

Next, words somewhat obscurely or fancifully used are *starving* (1), *stark* (10), *honeycomb* (15), *cobbled* (of pattens) (16), *lanterned* (24), *well* (49), *bergomask* (for village country dances?) (25), *belvedere* (of the spider's watch tower) (26).

While the following seem to us incorrectly used: *mumbling* (23) used of wings; the word is confined to the mouth whether as a manner of eating or of speaking: *crunch* (28) where the frosts crunch the grass: whereas they only make it crunchable. *maligns* (54) used as a neuter verb without precedent. *chinked* (58) of light

passing through a chink: and note the homophone chink, used of sound. And then the line

'The blackthorns clung with heapen sloes' (55)

contains two reprehensible liberties, because *clung* in its original proper sense means congealed or shrivelled; to *cling* was an intransitive verb meaning to adhere together: its modern use is to stick fast [to something]—and secondly, *heapen* is not a grammatical form; the p.p. is *heaped*.

Again, in the line

'He well may come with baits and trolls', (11)

we do not know whether *trolls* has something to do with pike-fishing, or merely means the reel on the rod. In that sense it lacks authority (?), moreover it is a homophone, used by our poet in

'And trolls and pixies unbeknown'. (18)

Finally, there are a good many English country names for common plants, for example, Esau's-hands, Rabbits'-meat, Bee's balsams, Pepper-gourds, Brandy-flowers, Flannel-weed, and Shepherd's rose; and some of these are excellent, and we very much wish that more of our good English plant-names could be distinctively attached.

We will not open the discussion here, except to say that the casual employment of local names is of no service because so many of these names are common to so many different plants. Our author's *Rabbits'-meat*, for instance, is applied to *Anthriscus sylvestris*, *Heracleum Spondylium*, *Oxalis Acetosella* and *Lamium purpureum*; all of which may be suitable rabbits' food. But each one of these plants has also a very wide choice of other names: thus *Anthriscus sylvestris*, besides being *Rabbits'-meat* may be familiarly introduced as Dill, Keck, Ha-ho, or Bun, and by some score of other names showing it to be disputed for by the ass, cow, dog, pig and even by the devil himself to make his oatmeal.

Heracleum Spondylium, alias Old Rot or Lumper-scrump, provides provender for cow, pig, swine, and hog, and also material for Bear's breeches.

Oxalis Acetosella is even richer in pet-names. After Rabbits'-meat, sheep-sorrel, cuckoo-spice, we find Hallelujah! Lady's cakes, and God Almighty's bread-and-cheese. These are selected from fifty names.

Lamium purpureum is not so polyonymous. With Tormentil, Archangel, and various forms of Dead-nettle, we find only Badman's Posies and Rabbits'-meat.

The worst perplexity is that well-known names, which one would think were securely appropriated, are often common property. Our authority for the above details—the *Dictionary of English Plant-names*, by James Britten and Robert Holland—tells us that *Orchis mascula*, the 'male orchis', is also called Cowslip, Crowsfoot, Ragwort, and Cuckoo-flower. This plant, however, seems to have suggested to the rustic mind the most varied fancies, similitudes of all kinds from 'Aaron's beard' to 'kettle-pad'.

THE Committee of the S.P.E. invite the membership of all those who are genuinely interested in the objects of the Society and willing to assist in its work. The Secretary will be glad to receive donations of any amount, great or small, which will be duly acknowledged and credited in the Society's banking account.

Members who wish to have the tracts of the Society forwarded to them as they are issued, should ensure this by sending a subscription of 10s. to the Secretary, who will then supply them for the current year of their subscription. The four tracts published in the last year were thus sent to a number of subscribers; and it would greatly assist the Society if all these would renew their subscriptions, and if others would subscribe for our forthcoming publications in the same manner. All donations and subscriptions should be sent to the Hon. Secretary,

L. PEARSALL SMITH,
11 ST. LEONARD'S TERRACE,
S.W. 3.

The prospectus of the Society will be found in Tract I, and further details in Tracts III and IV.

S. P. E.

TRACT No. VI

ON HYPHENS

&

SHALL & WILL, SHOULD & WOULD
in the newspapers of to-day

By

H. W. Fowler

CORRESPONDENCE, ETC.

George Saintsbury Robert Graves
John Sargeaunt



Oxford University Press

Oxford University Press
London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen
New York Toronto Melbourne Cape Town
Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai
Humphrey Milford Publisher to the UNIVERSITY

First edition, 1921

Printed photographically from the sheets of the First Edition

HYPHENS

THE chaos prevailing among writers or printers or both regarding the use of hyphens is discreditable to English education. Since it sufficiently proves by its existence that neither the importance of proper hyphenation nor the way to set about it is commonly known, this article may well begin with a dozen examples, all taken faithfully from newspapers, in which the wrong use or the wrong non-use of hyphens makes the words, if strictly interpreted, mean something different from what the writer intended. It is no adequate answer to such criticism to say that actual misunderstanding is unlikely; to have to depend on one's employer's readiness to take the will for the deed is surely a humiliation that no decent craftsman should be willing to put up with:

[In a list of beauty recipes] 5. *An infallible wrinkle-remover.* 6. *A superfluous hair-remover* (i. e. a hair-remover that no-one wants).

The financial record of the Lloyd George-Winston Churchill Government (i. e. of the Government composed of Lloyd, Churchill, and George Winston).

Mr. Scott Dickson, the ex-Tory Solicitor-General for Scotland (i. e. the Solicitor General who was formerly but no longer is a Tory).

The Unionist Housing of the Working-Classes Bill was read a second time yesterday (i. e. the way the Unionists house the Working-Classes Bill—Bill Sikes, presumably).

Grieving, as a Nonconformist, over the sins of his fellow-Free Churchmen (i. e. of his Churchmen who are unhampered by companions).

[Heading] *PEACE MEETING RIOT* (i. e. the way peace deals with riot; what is meant is riot at a peace-meeting).

Even the most bigoted anti-trade unionist (i. e. the unionist who is most opposed to trade).

The Chancellor plans to reconstruct the Bulow (Conservative-National-Liberal) Block (i. e. that of Conservatives,

Nationals, and Liberals ; what is meant is that of the Conservatives and the National-Liberals).

Last April the Acting-British Consul at Shiraz was attacked (i. e. the Consul who was pretending to be British).

And Sir Henniker-Heaton is more fortunate than many of those who cry in the wilderness (if Henniker is Christian name, no hyphen ; if it is surname, a Christian name is wanted).

If lay-writers can publish what they please, are naval officers to remain compulsorily silent ? (i. e. writers of lays).

[A Reichstag party] intent on introducing an anti-English and strong Navy agitation into the elections (i. e. a strong agitation about the Navy ; but what is meant is an agitation for a strong Navy).

Let us next put down a few specimens with corrections. It should first be observed that the most frequent cause of wrong hyphenating is the treating of two or more normally spaced words as though they were one word and could be, though so spaced, a single item in a hyphen-compound ; the least that can be done to double-barrelled adjectives, even when they stand alone, is to hyphen them ; Mr. Lloyd George (whether with or without a hyphen) forms the Lloyd-George Government (with one) ; the need is still greater when further complications come, but the result is then unsatisfactory—the Lloyd-George-Winston-Churchill Government. Obviously connexions of different power are needed ; a short and a long hyphen (-, —), or a single and a double one (-, ˘), would do (the Lloyd-George-Winston-Churchill Government, the Lloyd-George-Winston-Churchill G.) ; but this is an innovation that would hardly find acceptance ; and is better than — or ˘ (the Lloyd-George and Winston-Churchill G.) ; better than either is some evasion, the George-Churchill G., or the G. of Messrs. Lloyd George and Churchill. Specimens : *The mid-nineteenth century politicians* (politicians of the mid-nineteenth century) ; *British Columbia peaches* (British-Columbia peaches) ; *The Sidney Webb-Bernard Shaw-Fabian Society type of State interference* (State interference according to the ideas of Messrs. Sidney Webb and Bernard Shaw and the Fabian Society) ; *The silk stocking-tax* (the silk-stocking tax) ; *The Free Trade-Protectionist controversy* (the controversy between Free Trade and Protection ; or why not the Free-Trade controversy ?) ; *The South African-born Indians* (Indians born in South Africa) ; *Dean Stanley-*

street (Dean-Stanley Street); *Abingdon-street* (Abingdon Street); *The Sambre Canal-Scheldt front* (the Sambre-Canal and Scheldt front); *Mr. Cyril Maude was entertained at luncheon yesterday by his fellow-theatrical managers* (fellow theatrical managers).

The object so far has been to enlist the reader's interest by setting before him cases in which no technicalities are necessary, in which common sense is all that is wanted, and which, when thus collected, will surprise him by the evidence they afford that common sense is in fact far from common. But there are questions about hyphens less easy of solution than those already glanced at, and, before coming to them, we must look for some principles.

1. A hyphen is a symbol conveying that two or more words are made into one; the union may be for the occasion only (as in most of the examples above), or permanent (as in *fire-irons*, *committee-man*); the commonest form of temporary union is that in which a phrase (say *Home Rule*) is to be used attributively, i. e. as an adjective to another noun; to this end it must be marked as one word by the hyphen (*the Home-Rule Bill*).

2. The hyphen is not an ornament; it should never be placed between two words that do not require uniting and can do their work equally well separate; and on the other hand the conversion of a hyphened word into an unhyphened single one is desirable as soon as the novelty of the combination has worn off, if there are no obstacles in the way of awkward spelling, obscurity, or the like.

3. The proper functions of the hyphen may be thus classified :

A. To convert two or more separate words into a single one acting as one adjective or noun or other part of speech. Such unions of the temporary kind are *Housing-of-the-Working-Classes* as an epithet of *Bill*, and *strong-Navy* as epithet of *agitation*; permanent ones are *ne'er-do-well*, *stick-in-the-mud*, and *what's-his-name*, serving as noun, adjective, and pronoun.

[The hyphenated expressions here illustrated owe their hyphens to the grammatical liberty and convenience of considering a phrase as a 'part of speech'. Their hyphenation explains and satisfies the grammar and also makes them easier to read by the eye and ensures their proper accentuation if read aloud. This licence is open to great abuse and, in the aesthetics of speech, such resources

are often clumsy and incompatible with worthy style. But their convenience is indisputable and they represent also our common parlance. To handle them effectively in good prose requires mastery of style. Ed.]

B. To announce that a compound expression consisting of a noun qualified adjectively by the other element means something different from what its elements left separate would or might mean; that is, it has passed from description to designation of object. In this function the hyphen is a recognition in print of what has already happened in speech: that the compound has retained only one accent, and that on the first element, whereas the elements had originally two, of which the stronger was usually on the second (compare the accentuation of *Thrushes are not black birds* with that of *Thrushes are not black-birds* or *blackbirds*). This modification of accent may be better defined (and so would cover all cases) as enforcement of the initial accent at cost of the second: if it has not occurred, the hyphen is wrong and the words should be separate, or in some cases coalesced, but not hyphened (see p. 8, **Greatcoat*).

The expressions coming under this head are chiefly those of which the second element is a noun and the first is an adjective (as in *black-bird*, *red-coat*) or an attributive noun (as in *water-rat*).

C. To render such compound expressions as a verb and its object or other appurtenances, or a noun and its adjective, amenable to some treatment to which it could not otherwise be subjected. Thus *Court Martial*, if it is to have a possessive case (*The Court-Martial's decision was . . .*), must be one word; *long legs*, *storms beat*, *rend hearts*, *carry weight*, *come home*, *handle* by means of men*, *proof against bombs*, *spits fire*, *go by*, can be converted into handy adjectives, nouns, or verbs, fit to receive suffixes or to play the part that may be required of them in a sentence, by being combined with the hyphen (often afterwards dropped out) into single words; so we get *longlegged*, *storm-beaten*, *heartrending*, *weight-carrier*, *home-coming*, *man-handle*, *bombproof*, *spitfire*, and *the go-by*.

D. To show that two adjectives, each of which could be applied separately to a noun (*I saw a red hot face*, i. e. one both red and hot), are not to be so applied, but are to form one epithet conveying a compound idea (*holding a red-hot*

poker) ; such are *dark-blue*, *worldly-wise*, *mock-heroic*, *bitter-sweet*, *forcible-feeble*.

E. To attach closely to an active or passive participle an adverb or preposition preceding or following it that would not require hyphenating to the parent verb (you put up, not put-up, a job, but the result is a put-up job). The question whether this hyphenating is to be done or not is answered, as in B, by the accentuation ; the hyphen is wrong unless the compound will have a distinctly stronger accent on its first element than on the second ; thus *oft-repeated* will usually be hyphenated, and *ill served* usually not.

If the above statements and classification are adequate, we should now be able to pass judgement not only on the temporary combinations with which we started, but on the more difficult questions of permanent compounds. The guiding principles will be : no hyphenating of words that will do as well separate ; no hyphenating of words in the B or E class if they retain the normal accentuation ; no hyphenating together of double-barrelled expressions that themselves lack internal hyphens : the difference between hyphenating and full coalescence, in permanent compounds, a matter of expediency merely. It must be admitted on the one hand that the results will often differ from current usage, but on the other that that usage is so variable as to be better named caprice. Illustrative words will be roughly grouped, with occasional quotations to show that imaginary offences are not being set up in order to be knocked down, and the beginning of each group will be marked with an asterisk.

**Ex*-, *ante*-, *pre*-, *anti*-, *post*-, &c., are often wrongly prefixed to unhyphenated double expressions. The difficulty is real, but should always be circumvented ; e. g. the first quotation should be corrected to *opened the campaign against Home Rule*.

Quotations : *Mr. Austen Chamberlain opened the anti-Home Rule campaign* ; *The anti-high tariff Press in Germany* ; *In comparison with the pre-Boer war figures* ; *The ex-Chief Whip's association with the constituency* ; *ACTION BY AN EX-LORD MAYOR* ; *The ex-Navy League President*.

The solution, however, described above as unsatisfactory, which would give *anti-high-tariff*, *pre-Boer-war*, *ex-Chief-Whip*, &c., would not be as bad in this Latin-preposition group as elsewhere.

**Blue-stockings*, *black-cap*, *red herring*. Many wrong

hyphenings occur of words that correspond in form to the simplest B variety (adjective + noun), but lack one or both of the qualifications: *ruling class*, *easy going* (as noun, = freedom from obstacles), *clean living* (as noun, = clean life), *wooden leg*, and *steel cap*, have not even the required specialization of sense, and *red herring*, *golden syrup*, *full back*, *full stop*, *full pitch*, though they can claim this, have not the initial accent. Compare them with the legitimate *blackguard*, *black-cap*, *backwater*, and *blue-stocking*.

Quotations: *That touch of humanity which provides easy-going for whatever ship of venture he may be piloting*; *Charging the German ruling-class with the guilt of the war*; *To promote clean-living and the laws of health*; *The publication of such a book is an ill-service to the cause of Irish peace*; *Suspension of these controversies during the war was one good arising from that ill-wind*; *Language of this kind comes with specially ill-grace from a quarter that has ...*; *The middle-class began to find that youths from the Board Schools were ...*; *But for the war bonuses, a large part of the working-population would have starved*.

**Great coat, good will*. These expressions, which have very definite specialized senses by the side of their general ones, are violations, if hyphened, of the accent rule for B words, which holds for the overwhelming majority; they should therefore in the specialized senses always be made into single words without hyphens—*greatcoat, goodwill*.

It may perhaps be objected that, as hyphening is a middle stage between separation and fusion, an expression that is unfit for hyphening must *a fortiori* be unfit for full unity. The answer is this. While most phrases consisting of adjective (or attributive noun) + noun give the first part the main accent, there are yet many in which the second part, or noun, declines to abdicate in favour of its grammatical inferior, the adjective. Of these many, nearly all are perfectly comfortable without the hyphen; such, though often superfluously hyphened, are *mint sauce*, *north wind*, *penny whistle*, *quick march*, *top hat*, *apple pie*, *common sense*, *free lance*, *golden rod*, *sea air*, *salt beef*. On the other hand, a very small number of them, like *great coat* and *good will* and *arm chair*, protest loudly against separation. Now the hyphening of *mint-sauce* has undoubtedly a tendency to shift the accent, contrary to analogy, from *sauce* to *mint*. To write *good-will* and *arm-chair* and *great-coat* strengthens this tendency indirectly by obscuring the general truth that

hyphens in adjective + noun expressions correspond to a certain accent, and disturbs pronunciation, besides encouraging the use of needless hyphens. The three words appear in the *O.E.D.* (the main accent only being here given) as *goodwill'*, *great-coat'* or *greatcoat'*, and *arm-chair'*, which diversity suggests that at least there is no insuperable objection to the fusion; that it is profitable, if legitimate, seems clear.

**Court Martial, Governor General, Solicitor General, Princess Royal, time being.* Expressions of this type (noun followed by its adjective) require no hyphen, except in the possessive case, the mark of which cannot be affixed to the adjective until it is made one with the noun. It should be noticed that *Major-General*, &c., when used as prefixes to names, are on a different footing and take the hyphen, not under B (when the accent would be anomalous), but under C. The needless hyphen in *Court-Martial* is partly due to reaction from the verb made from it, which has to be fused, under C, into one word with or without the hyphen.

Quotation: *A beaten enemy who must for the time-being accept everything.*

**Lord Mayor, Lady Superior, lady help, deputy Speaker, rogue elephant, cock robin, actor manager, trial heat*, are examples of unqualified candidates for the B hyphen, differing from the previous groups in having the noun defined not by an actual adjective, but by a noun synonym serving as one; they all lack the accent qualification, and some of them the other as well, and should not be hyphenated. Compare with them the words *bulcalf*, *turkey-poult*, and *object-lesson*, also composed of synonyms, but having the required accent. As before, there are cases of specialized meaning without change of accent, e. g. *fellow man*, *man child*, *headmaster*, *headquarters*; these should not be hyphenated, but either kept separate or, if that seems impossible (as in *headquarters*), fully united. The difference should be noticed between *fellow man*, &c., which cannot claim their hyphen under B, and *fellow-feeling* (from to feel like a fellow), which can claim it under C.

**Rule of thumb.* In this the noun is defined not by an adjective, but by a phrase (*of thumb*); the accentuation again forbids the hyphen; the expression might be hyphenated under C for use as an adjective (*rule-of-thumb procedure*), but not as a noun under B. Concessions, however, have to be made to longer expressions of similar type

in which the orthodox accent becomes unmanageable, as *cat-o'-nine-tails*, *will-o'-the-wisp*.

Quotation: *Who warned us not to apply a rule-of-thumb to the delicate and responsible work of a judge.*

**Business man*, *hay fever*, *summer time*, *winter garden*, *sea change*, *sea monster*, *glass case*. In these unqualified candidates for B the place of the adjective is taken by an attributive noun: they all fail to pass the accent test. As to *summer time*, the kind here meant is Mr. Willett's, which is one thing, while God's *summer-time* or *summertime* is another; the distinction is not only not useless, but not even arbitrary, corresponding as it does to the two different ways in which sensible people pronounce the words. Similarly, the *glass case* meant is a glazed case, while *glass-case* means or would mean a case to hold glass. Compare with the words in this list, besides the genuine *summer-time* and *glass-case*, *missel-thrush* (i. e. mistletoe-thrush), *oak-apple*, *pew-rent*, *income-tax*, *Stock-Exchange*.

Quotations: *The business-men who clamour that imports shall not be allowed*; *Is now a warm supporter of summer-time*; *If our clocks had remained at summer-time*.

**Sub judice*, *ex officio*, *bonâ fide*, *bona fides*, *ex parte*, *ex postfacto*, *felo de se*. These should never be hyphenated except when the phrase happens to come under C and to require conversion in a particular sentence into an adjective; that is never the case with *bona fides*, very seldom with *sub judice* and *felo de se*, often with *bonâ fide* and *ex postfacto* and *ex officio*, and nearly always with *ex parte*. *Sits on the Committee ex officio*, compared with *Is an ex-officio member*, shows the difference. As these phrases, and others like them, are customarily printed in italics, the hyphen can really be dispensed with even where it is right, so that the safe course for the non-Latinist is never to hyphen them.

Quotation: *Until the point, which is practically sub-judice, has been decided.*

**From hand to mouth*, *in no wise*, *at any rate*, *above ground*, *up to date*. Hyphenating in such phrases is wrong, and most unsightly; *in no-wise* and *in nowise*, *at anyrate*, *from hand-to-mouth*, are not unusual blunders; and the fact that *up to date* is commonly turned into an adjective under C, and does then require hyphens, reacts upon the original phrase, which has no right to them, just as the verb *to court-martial* reacts upon the parent noun *Court Martial*.

Quotations: *The unburied past that still lay above-ground; Reforms which will bring the railways up-to-date; The Government, if it thinks only of these, will live from hand-to-mouth.*

**Put-up, sought-after, ill-served, oft-repeated, well-done.* Hyphenings of this type are resorted to oftener than they should be. The guiding principle is stated under E; a few examples (a) of such compounds that should not be hyphened, (b) of some that should be either hyphened or fused, and (c) of some that may be hyphened if it is intended that the first element shall be overwhelmingly accented but not otherwise, will perhaps carry conviction about the truth of this rule: (a) *Newspapers ill served with news; Such badly contrived measures; A faithfully kept promise; Hilarity put on for the occasion; A principle never lived up to:* (b) *Much sought-after opportunities; The above-mentioned facts; A put-up job; His oft-repeated advice; Such an outstanding personality* (to be hyphened by those who accent the *out*, and fully united by those who accent the *stand*); *The on-coming flood; The outgoing Ministry:* (c) *Well done or well-done beef; Little needed or little-needed economies.*

Quotation: *Indian newspapers are so ill-served with local news that . . .*

Any reader who has been interested by the various questions that have arisen in this lengthy article may like to glance over a list of the specimens of wrong hyphenation contained in it; the order is that in which they have occurred above, so that what was said about them may be referred to without much difficulty; they are all printed in the wrong form, standing here in the pillory: *Superfluous hair-remover; The Lloyd George-Winston Churchill Government; The Unionist Housing of the Working-Classes Bill; His fellow-Free Churchmen; Peace meeting riot; The bigoted anti-trade unionist; The Conservative-National-Liberal Block; The Acting-British Consul; Sir Henniker-Heaton; Lay-writers; A strong Navy agitation; The mid-nineteenth century politicians; British Columbia peaches; The Sidney Webb-Bernard Shaw-Fabian Society type; The silk stocking-tax; The Free Trade-Protectionist controversy; South African-born Indians; Dean Stanley-street; Abingdon-street; The Sambre Canal-Scheldt front; His fellow-theatrical managers; The anti-Home Rule campaign; The anti-high tariff Press; The pre-Boer war figures; The*

ex-Chief Whip; An ex-Lord Mayor; The ex-Navy League President; Red-hering; Golden-syrup; Full-back; Full-stop; Full-pitch; Easy-going (n.); The ruling-class; A wooden-leg; Clean-living (n.); An ill-service; Ill-wind; With ill-grace; The middle-class; The working-population; Great-coat; Good-will; Court-Martial; Governor-General; Solicitor-General; Princess-Royal; The time-being; Lord-Mayor; Lady-Superior; Lady-help; Deputy-Speaker; Rogue-elephant; Cock-robin; Actor-Manager; Trial-heat; Fellow-man; Man-child; Head-Master; Headquarters; Rule-of-thumb (n.); Business-man; Hay-fever; Summer-time (Willett's); Winter-garden; Sea-change; Sea-monster; Glass-case; Sub-judice; Ex-officio (adv.); Bonâ-fide (adv.); Ex-parte (adv.); Ex-post-facto; Felo-de-se; From hand-to-mouth; In no-wise; At anyrate; Above-ground; Up-to-date (adv.); Ill-served.

H. W. FOWLER.

[NOTES

p. 5, I. 22.

When a hyphened word becomes sufficiently current and familiar to cast its hyphen, it must also cast the capital initial of its second component, if it had one in its hyphened form, e.g. *Home-Rule* would become *Homerule*. The impropriety of writing a capital letter in the middle of a word will thus sometimes forbid coalescence, as in this example, see next note.

p. 8, l. 27.

The recognition of the passage from hyphenation to coalescence implies that there must always be some compounds in which the hyphen is a matter of taste. Also that words will retain their accustomed hyphen after it has ceased to be useful or advisable, because the eye will prefer what it is accustomed to see. The eye also raises another objection to the coalescence of words, and that is, when the joint of the words suggests an interpretation of their symbols quite different from what they had in separation. Thus *Homerule* looks like a Latin diminutive, and would naturally be read *Hómmerule*. It is probable that the coalescence of *e* and *i* in *fire-irons* is our reason for preferring it to *fireirons*; and

that we cannot write *committeeman*, because the *ee* spelling asks for an accent, which is absurd. In all such cases the hyphen is retained to save appearances, and nothing more definite than this general propriety can be ruled.

The frequent mispronunciation of place-names with the suffix *-ham*, as *Petersham* and *Grantham*, would not have occurred had the components been hyphened: and they exhibit the motives for our retaining the hyphens in some compounds. So the mute *s* of *island* asserts itself in *Burntisland*.

ED.]

SHALL AND WILL, SHOULD AND WOULD IN THE NEWSPAPERS OF TO-DAY

The grammatical rules for the right use of shall, will, should, and would, are very elaborate, and any one who studies them¹ must see that a complete understanding of them cannot be expected from ordinary writers and speakers. It is moreover true that a correct habit of speech is of more practical importance than a knowledge of the rules, although it is to the rules (when correctly set out) that our final appeal must be made in correcting or deciding our practice. Only confusion results from incorrect writing or speaking. Now on the supposition that most people *generally* use these words correctly, whether or no they are aware of the abstract principles, the easiest way of ensuring that they shall *always* speak them correctly is to point out the commonest mistakes.

It is therefore the object of this paper to exhibit groups of sentences all from newspapers of the better sort, in which one or other principle of idiom has been outraged. The reader will thus have before him a conspectus of the pitfalls that are most to be feared.

Each group is headed by a statement of the rule which the examples violate.

1. Plain future and conditional. 2. *I would like.* 3. Indefinite future and relative. 4. Elegant variation. 5. *That*-clauses. 6. Decorative and prophetic *shall*.

1. Plain future or conditional statements and questions in the first person should have *shall*, *should*; the roman-type *wills* and *woulds* in the following examples are wrong: *It is impossible to exaggerate the terrible consequences of this proposed act; in Egypt, in India, in every country from the Mediterranean to the frontiers of China, we will teach the*

¹ They can be seen in *The King's English* (Fowler), pp. 133 and foll.: or in *O. E. D.* under *shall*. No grammar or dictionary can be held to have done its duty if it has not laid down the necessary rules. [ED.]

lesson that no reliance can be placed on the word of England./ This is pleasant reading; but we won't get our £2000 this year./ Perhaps we will soon be surfeited by the unending stream of 'new' literature, and will turn with relief to . . . / We might not be able to get all the oil we wanted from our coal, but we would always get enough to prevent . . . / What exactly was the original total of the Turkish forces in this area we do not know—and probably never will./ He was plain to read from the beginning, and could hardly, we would have supposed, have made an appeal to a girl of this character./ But the late King Edward brushed aside all such nonsense; and where would we be to-day without the French 'entente'? / If we traced it back far enough we would find that the origin was . . . / If we permit our contribution to be substituted for a part of the building programme, we will be casting our vote with the 'little navy' people./ If we compare these two statements, we will see that so far as this point goes they agree./ I would not be doing right if I were to anticipate that communication./ If it were true, the Germans would be right, and we would be wrong./ If British trade interests are to be revived, we will stand in need of these men who know Russia./ But if the re-shuffling of the world goes on producing new 'issues', I will, I fear, catch the fever again./ To the average citizen it would appear that in forestalling this plot we would in fact be rendering the German people no less service than . . . / I think I would be a knave if I announced my intention of handing over my salary to . . . / It is quite clear that when Home Rule is being fought in the Commons I will have to devote all my time to it./ Reports of fighting in China are as conflicting as we would expect./ I am confident that within three years we employers will be reaping benefit from it./ We have collected more in consequence of that valuation than we would have done without it./ We never know when we take up the morning paper, some of us, which side we will be on next./ The whole story of the rescue of the men from Kerrig Island is a heroism of the sea which we will do well to realize./ Mr. F. H. Thomas's vision of the Utopia in which we will live 'When Labour Rules'.

In all these the idea of intention, volition, choice, &c., which goes with *will* or *would* in the first person, is plainly out of the question. Two examples follow in which such an idea is precluded not by the actual words quoted, but by the unquoted context; in such cases the offence against

idiom is aggravated by the possibility of misinterpretation: *We would thus get at once the thing wanted: an opera open practically all the year round* (idiomatic sense, We aim at getting thus: intended sense, This, if it were not unfortunately impossible, would give us). '*Who's Who*' is entirely without a competitor; and there is perhaps no book on our reference shelves that we would miss sooner (idiomatic sense, There is no book we should be so glad to be rid of: intended sense, There is no book we should so quickly feel the want of). Two other examples will provide for a common exception to the rule as given absolutely above. In sentences that are, actually or virtually, reported, a verb that as reported is in the first person but was originally in the second or third often keeps *will* or *would*: *People have underrated us, some even going so far as to say that we would not win a single test match* (the people said *You*, or *They, will not*, which justifies, though it by no means necessitates, *We would not* in the report)./ *He need not fear that we will be 'sated' by narratives like his* (his fear was *They, or You, will be sated*, which makes *We will not* indeed advisable, but defensible).

2. The verbs *like*, *prefer*, *care*, *be glad*, *be inclined*, &c., are very common in first-person conditional statements (*I should like to know*, &c.). In these *should*, not *would*, is the right form. '*I would like to say*' is no more idiomatic English than '*I would find it hard to say*'; but hundreds of people who would be horrified by the latter are ready to write the former. The explanation is to be found in confusion between two possible ways of speaking, the modern '*I should like to say*' and the archaic '*I would say*'; in the modern form the desire is expressed in the verb *like* and requires no other expression; in the archaic form the desire had to be given in *would* because otherwise it was not expressed at all. The roman-type *woulds* and *wills*, then, are all wrong: *In regard to the general question, I would like to speak to-day with a certain amount of reserve.*/ *The other argument upon which I would like to comment is as follows.*/ *We must shut our ears to the tales of some of the lame dogs we would like to help over a stile.*/ *We cannot go into details, and would prefer to postpone criticism until . . .*/ *Nor has he furnished me with one thing with which I would care to sit down in my little room and think.*/ *I, as chief Liberal Whip, will be very glad to*

place them in touch with the local secretary./ If we should take a wider view, I would be inclined to say that . . . / In this month of 'grey rain and silver mist' we will be glad to keep within our average rainfall of a little over 2 in. . . .

An example less patently wrong is: We would be the last to argue that publication in this form commits our contemporary to agreement with the views expressed. This is defensible if the writer will assure us that his meaning was We should wish to be the last, instead of, as it doubtless was, We should be the last.

3. In clauses of indefinite future time, and indefinite relative clauses in future time, *will* is entirely unidiomatic; either *shall* is used, chiefly in formal contexts, or, much more often, futurity is allowed to be inferred and a present is used: *Whatever sum and whatever goods will be received from Germany will be shared among the Allies* (shall be received)./ *Germany will have to give back all kinds of property which have been taken from the invaded countries, and which will be traced in German territory* (shall be traced). . . . *has now had to go clean out of the county to find employment, leaving his wife with her mother until he will be able to make another home for her* (until he can make)./ *So long as this will not be made clear, the discussion will go on bearing lateral issues* (is not made)./ *When this will be perceived by public opinion the solution will immediately become obvious* (is perceived)./ *When the Irish vote has been reduced by Home Rule, and the remaining Irish members will no longer have any reason to oppose a Suffrage Bill, Votes for Women will once more have a chance* (members have no longer any reason)./ *The farmers were expecting to get increased prices, and they will naturally be 'considerably annoyed' if they do not get them, especially when they will be called upon to pay increased prices for all that they have to buy* (when they are called upon).

Here also a less undeniably wrong example may be of service: *We have strong faith that a rally to the defence of the Act will be a feature of next year's politics, if the Tory Party will have the courage to come into the open and declare war upon it.* An assurance from the writer that by *will have the courage* he meant *chooses to have the courage* would be received, indeed, with incredulity, but would secure him a grudging acquittal; *has (or have) the courage* is what he should have written.

4. The time-honoured 'I will be drowned, no-one shall save me', so much too good to be true, is less convincing as a proof that there are people to whom the English distinctions mean nothing than the discovery that *shall* and *will*, *should* and *would*, are sometimes regarded as good raw material for elegant variation: 'I said *should* in the last clause; the one now to come is sadly similar to it; go to! let me write down *would*': *If we found the instances invariably in mutual support we would be content with but a few, but if we found even one in contradiction we should require a large body of evidence.* / *We should have been exposed to the full power of his guns, and, while adding to our own losses, would have forgone the advantage of inflaming his.* / *The control of Bessarabia, until such time as Russia shall be restored and the people will be free to pronounce for their return to Russia, by the League of Nations.* / *You shall not find two leaves of a tree exactly alike, nor will you be able to examine two hands that are exactly similar.* / *Words requiring the local authority to see that when vacancies occurred the appointments should be consistent with the terms of the trust, and the teachers chosen would be qualified to give the special religious instruction.* But the follies to which elegant variation gives rise are without number.

5. *That*-clauses after *intend* or *intention*, *desire*, *demand*, *be anxious*, &c., have *shall* and *should* for all persons. Among the &c. are not included *hope*, *anticipate*, and the like; but the drawing of the line is not easy; roughly, *shall* and *should* are used when the word on which the *that*-clause depends expresses an influence that affects the result, as a demand does, but a hope or fear does not; a serviceable illustration is *expect*; mistresses expect (i. e. demand) that their maids *shall* wear caps; but we expect (i. e. are of opinion) that to-morrow *will* be fine. Examples of the wrong *will* are: *I am anxious that, when permanently erected, the right site will be selected.* / *And it is intended that this will be extended to every division and important branch.* / *The strong desire that the relations of the English-speaking peoples will be so consolidated that they may act as one people.* / *One of the conditions of improvement is that the help given to the deserving poor will be removed from the taint of Poor Law associations.*

6. The decorative second or third person *shall* as in the

quotation following is an archaism, before using which, as before using other archaisms, a writer should be very sure that his style in general will stand comparison with that of the few who have archaized to good purpose: *You shall have watched, it may be, the ways of birds and beasts in a garden or wood for half a lifetime; and your friend, the first time that you show him your preserves, shall straightway walk up the leverets, or point out the goldcrest's nest which you have always wanted to find.* No-one will suggest that that is a maliciously chosen specimen; it is better than nine out of ten that one comes upon in the newspapers; but one who has a real right to this *shall* would have put otherwise 'the first time that you show him your preserves' and the 'nest which you have always wanted to find'. Distinguished from this, far less conscious and artificial, but also better avoided, is the use of second or third person *shall* that may be called the oracular-prophetic: *It has already found an honoured place in our national collections; there will come a time when collectors shall fight for it.*

H. W. FOWLER.

CORRESPONDENCE

IDIOM, SOLECISM, AND OBSCURITY

Mr. George Saintsbury writes:

Perhaps there are no two things that have been more often confounded by martinets in practical rhetoric than Idiom and Solecism: indeed only Sir Positive At-all would attempt to give an infallible rule for distinguishing them. It is quite certain that not a few critics who denounce things as bad English merely indicate their own insufficient acquaintance with good; and that here as elsewhere 'Read! read! read!' is the only sound prescription. There are as many different franchises in the body literary of English as there used to be in the body politic; and it will be an ill day when they are all merged in a ghastly and characterless uniformity.

There is one criterion of justifiable or unjustifiable 'difficulty' in style which is commonly ignored by defenders thereof. Is the 'difficulty', 'obscurity', 'strangeness' (or whatever it may be called) in the body and substance of the thought, or of the expression, or of both? Or on the other hand is it more or less obviously a superinduced garment? nay, an over-garment deliberately added? To illustrate what is meant, is there not a remarkable difference in this respect between the difficulty of Carlyle or of Browning and that of George Meredith or of Henry James? To some people there is no evidence of 'second thought' in either of the first pair. It would be mere silliness to suggest that *The French Revolution* was first written or even planned in the style of Southey's prose, or *Mr. Sludge the Medium* in that of Wordsworth's verse; bad or good, pure or impure, they are *de bonne foi* as they stand. Is it so with the others? Their admirers may say 'yes', but to some of us they bear unmistakable marks of 'translation'—translation so long continued as to be at best almost automatic but still trans-

lation. Now as old-fashioned writing-masters used to say, 'Never paint', that is to say touch up your strokes, so it may be said, 'Never translate'.

G. S.

[We welcome Mr. Saintsbury's letter, but we doubt if what he denounces as 'translation' is within the province of our Society. We are not sure that we should follow him in his analysis; but if the more or less of the artificially superimposed quality to which he is objecting, were, in these four writers, to be comparatively measured by how far it was removed from their ordinary habit and manner of talking, then Henry James might be judged to have been the most natural of them all, for he talked as he wrote, and in his latter days it was a marvel to hear him.

If it should be asked how he came by his matured style, it would seem from his earlier work that he gradually developed it to carry the increasing subtleties of his presentations. Of Carlyle on the other hand one would infer from his writings that his peculiar style began as the best expression that he could invent for his young urgent thought: and the relation between the two was quite honest. The question would be whether, when this violent style became habitual, it was always suitable or even adaptable to the matter in hand. Over-emphasis of genuine feeling is in art as much a fault as weakness in the expression of it: so that one may wrongly learn to dislike Cromwell solely from a reading of Carlyle's panegyric.

'Translation' is perhaps not the best name for the quality that Mr. Saintsbury condemns; because it might be justly said that the very best writers translate or transfer everything into their own style. Plainly the styles of great writers differ, and the necessity of catching the public ear must increasingly drive them, and much more the lesser talents, to novelties of invention. All art is elaborate, and the elaboration of a writer may be said to have two distinct conscious aims; it is either to get nearer and nearer to complete and perfect expression of his thought, or to render it more striking and attractive. Putting mere incompetence and clumsiness and all accidents of imperfection aside, it is when the secondary aim of being effective overrides the intrinsic aim of just and artistic expression that the main 'vices' of style arise; and the faults, however they arise, are

within our technical province only so far as they are linguistic or grammatical peculiarities that offend or pall upon a healthy aesthetic intelligence: we are not concerned with their psychological aspect, but whatever a man's idiosyncrasy may be, bad or good, attractive or revolting, it is no dishonesty in him to invent a peculiar style for its expression. Varieties of style, as Mr. Saintsbury says, are to be welcomed. Henry James' writings reveal a nature so singularly loving and lovable that he can win his readers to admire even the peculiarly involved and punctilious style which he found congenial to himself; it seems to them his natural voice: and though it might be possible to show that he fell into tricks of speech which can be analysed, labelled, and censured, would it not be surely the same with the other three?

ED.]

THE DANGERS OF DEFINITION

To the Editor of the S. P. E. tracts.

SIR,

As one rather more interested in the choice, use, and blending of words than in the niceties of historical grammar, and having no greater knowledge of etymology than will occasionally allow me to question vulgar derivations of place-names, I would like to sound a warning against the attempt to purify the language too much—‘one word, one meaning’ is as impossible to impose on English as ‘one letter, one sound’. By all means weed out homophones, and wherever a word is overloaded and driven to death let another bear part of the burden; suppress the bastard and ugly words of journalese or commerce; keep a watchful eye on the scientists; take necessary French and Italian words out of their italics to give them an English spelling and accentuation; call a bird or a flower by its proper name, revive useful dialect or obsolescent words, and so on till the cows come home; that is the right sort of purification, but for Goodness’ sake let it be tactfully done, let the Dictionary be a hive of living things and not a museum of minutely ticketed fossils. A common-sense precision in writing is clearly necessary; one has only to read a page or two of Nashe, Lylly, or (especially) the lesser Euphuists to come to this conclusion; their sentences often can have meant no more to themselves than a mere grimace or the latest sweep of the hat learned in Italy. A common-sense precision, yes, but when the pedantic scientist accuses the man in the street of verbal inexactitude the latter will do well to point out to the scientist that of all classes of writers, his is the least accurate of any in the use of ordinary words. Witness a typical sentence, none the better for being taken from a book which has made an extremely important contribution to modern psychological research, and is written by a scientist so enlightened that, dispensing almost entirely with the usual scientific jargon, he has improvised his own

technical terms as they are needed for the argument. Very good words they are, such as would doubtless be as highly approved by the Society of Pure English in Session as they have been by the British Association. This Doctor X is explaining the unaccountable preknowledge in certain insects of the needs they will meet after their metamorphosis from grub to moth. He writes :

... This grub, after a life completely spent within the channels in a tree-trunk which it itself manufactures. . . .

'Yes,' said Doctor X to me, 'somehow the two "it"'s coming together look a bit awkward, but I have had a lot of trouble with that sentence and I came to the conclusion that I'd rather have it clumsy than obscure.' I pointed out that the 'tree-trunk which' was surely not what he meant, but that the faults of the sentence lay deeper than that. He was using words not as winged angels always ready to do his command, but as lifeless counters, weights, measures, or automatic engines wrongly adjusted. A *grub* cannot *manufacture* a *channel*. Even a human being who can manufacture a boot or box can only *scoop* or *dig* a channel. And you can only have a *channel* on the outer surface of a tree; inside a tree you have *tunnels*. A tunnel you *drive* or *bore*. A grub cannot be *within* either a channel or a tunnel (surely) in the same way as a fly is found *within* a piece of amber. Doctor X excused himself by saying that 'scientists are usually functionally incapable of visualization', and that 'normal mental visualization is dangerous, and abnormal visualization fatal to scientific theorizations, as offering tempting vistas of imaginative synthetical concepts unconfirmed by actual investigation of phenomena' — or words to that effect. Unaware of the beam in his own eye, our Doctor complains more than once in his book of the motes in the public eye, of the extended popular application of scientific terms to phenomena for which they were never intended, until they become like so many blunted chisels. On the other hand, he would be the first to acknowledge that over-nice definition is, for scientific purposes, just as dangerous as blurring of sense; Herr Einstein was saying only the other day that men become so much the slaves of words that the propositions of Euclid, for instance, which are abstract processes of reason only holding good in reference to one another, have been taken to apply absolutely in concrete cases, where they do not. Over-definition, I am

trying to show, discourages any modification of the idea for which it acts as hieroglyph. It even seems that the more precise a word, the less accurate it is in its relation to other closely-defined words.

There is a story of a governess who asked her charges what was the shape of the earth? 'It may conveniently be described as an oblate spheroid' was the glib and almost mutinous answer. 'Who told you girls that?' asked the suspicious Miss Smithson. A scientific elder brother was quoted as authority, but Miss Smithson with commendable common sense gave her ruling, 'Indeed that may be so, and it may be not, but it certainly is *nicer* for little girls to say that the earth is more or less the shape of an orange'.

From which fruit, as conveniently as from anywhere else, can be drawn our homely moral of common sense in the use of words. As every schoolboy I hope doesn't know, the orange is the globose fruit of that rutaceous tree the *citrus aurantium*, but as every schoolboy certainly is aware, there are several kinds of orange on the market, to wit, the ordinary everyday sweet orange from Jaffa or Jamaica, the bitter marmalade orange that either comes or does not come from Seville, the navel orange, and the excellent 'blood', with several other varieties. Moreover the orange has as many *points* as a horse, and parts or processes connected with its dissection and use as a motor-bicycle. 'I would I were an Orenge Tree, that busie Plante', sighed George Herbert once. I wonder how Herbert would have anatomized his Orenge, then a rarer fruit than to-day when popular affection and necessary daily intercourse have wrapped the orange with a whole glossary of words as well as with tissue-paper. Old gentlemen usually *pare* their oranges, but the homophonic barrage (which we now rhyme with *Harwich*) of puns when Jones *père* prepares to pare a pair of—even oranges (let alone another English-grown fruit), has taught the younger generations either to peel a norange or skin their roranges. *Peel* (subst.) is ousting *rind*; a pity because there is also *peal* as a homophone; but I am glad to say that what used to be called *divisions* are now almost universally known as *fingers* or *pigs* (is the derivation from the tithe- or parson's pig known by its extreme smallness?); the seeds are 'pips', and quite rightly too, because in this country they are seldom used for planting, and 'pip' obviously means that when you squeeze them between forefinger and thumb they are a useful form

of minor artillery ; then there is the white pithy part under the outer rind ; I have heard this called *blanket*, and that is pretty good, but I have also heard it called *kill-baby*, and that is better ; for me it will always remain *kill-baby*. On consulting *Webster's International Dictionary* I find that there is no authority or precedent for calling the withered calix on the orange the *kim*, but I have done so ever since I can remember, and have heard the word in many respectable nurseries (it has a fascination for children), and I can't imagine it having any other name. Poetical wit might call it 'the beauty-patch on that fairy orange cheek' ; heraldry might blazon it, on *tenne*, as a *mullet, vert, for difference* ; and contemporary slang would probably explain it as that 'rotten little star-shaped gadget at the place where you shove in your lump of sugar' ; but *kim* is obviously the word that is wanted, it needs no confirmation by a Dictionary Revisal Committee or National Academy. There it is, you can hardly get away from it. Misguided supporters of the Society of Pure English, resisting the impulse to say casually 'the yellow stuff round my yorange' and 'the bits inside, what you eat', and knowing better than to give us *exocarp*, *carpel*, and *ovule*, will, however, perhaps misunderstand the aims of the Society by only using literary and semi-scientific language, by insisting on *paring* the *integument* and afterwards removing the *divisions* of their fruit for *mastication*. But pure English does not mean putting back the clock ; or doing mental gymnastics. Let them rather (when they don't honestly push in that lump of sugar and suck) *skin* off the *rind*, ignoring the *kim* and scraping away the *kill-baby*, then pull out the *pigs*, *chew* them decently, and put the *pips* to their proper use.

Good English is clear, easy, unambiguous, rich, well-sounding, but not self-conscious ; for too much pruning kills. Who of us wants to see the S. P. E. degenerating into a National Academy or an Eisteddfodd Adjudication Committee ?

ROBERT GRAVES.
Islip, Oxon.

[We can only say that if there is any such ' who of 'em ', he will be disappointed. ED.]

GLADIOLUS¹

¹ See *Tract IV*, p. 7.

An anonymous correspondent raises an objection to the antepenultimate stress in *gladiolus*, on the ground of the French *glaïeul*, and he cites a rule of Brachet's: 'L'accent latin persiste en français dans tous les mots d'origine populaire; tous les mots où cette loi est violée sont d'origine savante.'

Now on this point Quintilian is express. I quote Mr. Butler's new translation in the Loeb classics: 'In every word the acute accent is restricted to three syllables, whether these be the only syllables in the word or the three last, and will fall either on the penultimate or [on] the antepenultimate.' (1. 5. 30.) The Plautine and Terentian stress of *gládiolus* had in Quintilian's time long been extinct. The explanation of my correspondent's doubt is that in words like *gladiolus* vulgar Latin came to lengthen the penultimate *o*, and in consequence the stress was shifted onto this vowel. Thus, while Terence said *Puteöli* and Cicero and Quintilian *Putëöli*, the vulgar came to say *Puteöli*, whence comes the present *Pozzuöli*. The same change may be seen in the Italian *figliuolo* and the French *filleul*.

JOHN SARGEAUNT.

CRITICAL ANIMADVERSIONS

A critic who rightly objects to the abuse of denoting titles by initials, complains that our society is not well known enough to justify our always alluding to it as S.P.E. Also that P.S.P. (on page 45 of second tract) for Public-School Pronunciation was unintelligible to him. Also that *N.E.D.* for *New English Dictionary*—which is the original title of the great Oxford Dictionary, will not serve. We have already corrected this last mistake and shall henceforth always designate that indispensable work as *O.E.D.*

Again, in *Tract* iv, p. 37, we personally agree with him in preferring *Burns'* to *Burns's*; but when he adds that the usual pronunciation is *Burnz* and not *Burnzes*, we think he is wrong. *Burnz* is possessive of *Burn*; and so the possessive of *Keats*, though written *Keats'*, is *Keatsez*.

The inconvenience of having to denote the possessive cases of names and even of common nouns ending in *s* by a second sibilant has naturally led to difficulties and uncertainties of use. It would seem from Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar* [§ 471] that there must have been a strong tendency to eschew the second sibilant altogether, at the cost of intelligible expression. The experiment, if it was made, was unsuccessful; but it shows that there is a break in our tradition: and it would be interesting and useful to explore the subject.

Again, Mr. Brander Matthews' American claim for 'farm-hand' (*Tract* iv, p. 42) is disputed—a quotation is needed to decide this—and the value of some of his American words may be questioned, but not his approval of them. From a book entitled *American English* (Alfred A. Knopf) the author, Gilbert M. Tucker, is quoted in *The Bookman* of New York of June 19, thus: 'As a matter of fact, American English is not only not inferior to British English, but, in more than one way, palpably and overwhelmingly its superior. It is more natural, more resilient, more hospitable

to ideas, tremendously more vivid and brilliant. All the qualities that the Society for Pure English try to bring back into the English of London and Oxford—its Elizabethan picturesqueness of trope and phrase, its eager borrowing of dialectic (*sic*) novelties, its voracious appetite for loan-words, its disdain of all the snuffling imbecilities of grammarians—these qualities are the very hall-marks of the English of Chicago and New York.'

[We rejoice, and repeat our desire for American co-operation. ED.]

S. P. E.

TRACT No. *VII*

ENGLISH INFLUENCE

ON THE

FRENCH VOCABULARY

By

Paul Barbier



At the Clarendon Press

M DCCCC XXII

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Amen Corner *London EC 4*

29-35 West 32nd Street *New York*

Cathedral Buildings *Melbourne*

100 Princes Street *Edinburgh*

104 West George Street *Glasgow*

25-27 Richmond Street West *Toronto*

17-19 Elphinstone Circle *Bombay*

10 Esplanade George Town *Madras*

Temple Chambers, Old Post Office Street *Calcutta*

Markham's Buildings, Adderley Street *Cape Town*

C 445 Honan Road *Shanghai*

HUMPHREY MILFORD *Publisher to the University*

ENGLISH INFLUENCE ON THE FRENCH VOCABULARY

THE EARLY PHASE

[THE great interest and the permanent value of the following paper are not likely to be disputed. It may, however, at first sight appear that the subject has little or no pertinence to the special aims of the S. P. E., and that therefore Prof. Barbier's paper is out of place as one of the Tracts issued by the Society. But the influence of French on English and that of English on French are the two sides of one and the same process, which to be rightly understood and judged needs to be studied as a whole. Our Society is, of course, *directly* concerned only with one side of this process. But the history of English words in French, sometimes instructively similar, sometimes instructively dissimilar, to the history of French words in English, is full of useful suggestion for us. If we seek to discover why, of the countless foreign words that have come into the English vocabulary during the last three centuries, some have found a permanent footing, while others have not, and why some must be prized as real additions to the wealth of our language, and others condemned as impairing its purity or interfering with its healthy growth, we cannot fail to find a good deal of help in the study of the facts which Prof. Barbier has here set forth with a completeness never before attempted. We venture to hope that the members of the S. P. E. will regard the present Tract as one of the most valuable of the series.—ED.]

IT is the intention, in the following short monograph to give some statistics on the earlier phase of English influence on French.

In the sixteenth century, this influence does not exist. In the seventeenth, down to the Revocation of the edict of Nantes in 1685, it is but small. The reign of Charles I, his French marriage, his struggles with Parliament and his execution, passionately interested the French; their attention was at last turned northward and is shown by the publica-

tion of such works as Du Gard's *Nouvelles ordinaires de Londres*, 1650 sq.; S. Laurens' *Un subside accordé au roy d'Angleterre*, 1656; S. de Sorbière's *Relation d'un Voyage en Angleterre*, 1664; Chamberlayne's *L'Estat présent d'Angleterre*¹, 1669. In these books are found some of the earliest instances of English words in a French context.

But our real landmark is the revocation of the edict of Nantes and the consequent flight of many Huguenots to England. From that date translations into French of English books abound, and the Huguenots are responsible for most of the early ones. English institutions and English ideas are boomed in the Journals of the Refugees. The seed is sown which will bear fruit in the French revolution.

I

Dealing first with the important political and administrative vocabulary, it is well to note that two important early sources of information are the English part of Miège's *Great French Dictionary*, published in 1687, and the *Histoire des Guerres civiles d'Angleterre*, translated from Clarendon and published in six volumes, the first four of which appeared in 1704 and the last two in 1709. They will be repeatedly quoted as authorities in my lists.

I shall make use of the following abbreviations. After a word I put the date of the earliest known instance of its use in French, followed by the authority:

DG = *Dictionnaire général de la langue française*, by Hatzfeld and Darmesteter.

B = E. Bonnaffé, *Dictionnaire des Anglicismes*, 1920.

M = Miège, *Le Grand Dictionnaire François*, vol. ii (English-French), 1687.

MLR = P. Bafbier, *Loan-words from English in Eighteenth-Century French* in *Modern Language Review*, xvi (1921).

OED = *The Oxford English Dictionary*.

Where I can quote earlier instances than are found in any of these authorities, I give the references in full. A few words appear without quotations or references; these are known to have been used in French before 1815, but the writer has been unable to find examples.

¹ That is to say, the French translation of E. Chamberlayne's *Notitia Angliae, or the Present State of England*. The first edition of the English book appeared in 1668; the second edition (enlarged) was published in 1669, and it is this that was used by the French translator.

I propose to subdivide the political and administrative terms of English origin and used in French into three series. The first is made up of the merely historical terms which are no longer in ordinary use in French or English:

1. *cavalier*. 1687 *Miège*.
2. *chambre étoilée*. 1704 *Clarendon*, i. 91.
3. *covenant*. 1640 St. Amant, *Les Pourveus Bachiques in Œuvres*, ed. 1855, i. 326: 'Qu'avec le fouet des convenans L'Escosse estrille l'Angleterre.'
4. *covenantaire*. 1704 *Clarendon*, i. 154, *convenanciers*; id. i. 166, *convenantiers*; later *covenanter* and *covenantaire*.
5. *cromwellisme*. 1688 *MLR*.
6. *cromwelliste*. 1666 *Les Continuateurs de Loret*, ed. Rothschild, i. 887: 'La semence crommueliste Par qui l'hydre anti-royaliste Renaît à Londie incessamment'.
7. *doomsday book*. 1688 *B Suppl.*
8. *goodman*. 1770 *Grosley, Londres*, ed. 1774, iii. 283, 300.
9. *heptarchie*. 1687 *Miège*.
10. *jacobite*. 1701 *Nouvelles de la Républ. des Lettres*, Nov., p. 573.
11. *jacobitisme*. 1718 De Cize, *Hist. du Whigisme*, 280.
12. *premunire*. 1704 *Clarendon*, i. 313.
13. *prétendant* (of the two Stuart pretenders). 1718 De Cize, *Hist. du Whigisme*, 332.
14. *protecteur* (of Cromwell). 1687 *Miège*. Of the sixteenth-century protector, Hertford, cf. 1547 *Corresp. polit. d'O. de Selve*, ed. Lefèvre-Pontalis, p. 99: 'Pour le gouvernement de son dict filz, qui est aagé de ix à x ans, et du royaulme, le dict seigneur a laissé le conte de Harfert uncle maternel du dict jeune roy, qui a tiltre de protecteur et deffenseur du roy et du royaulme . . .'
15. *protectorat* (of Cromwell's government.)
16. *rump*. 1709 *Clarendon*, vi. 636; cf. vi. 660 *rump parlement*.
17. *straffordien*. 1704 *Clarendon*, i. 323.
18. *test*. 1687 *MLR*.
19. *tête-ronde*. 1644 St. Amant, *Albion*, in *Œuvres*, ed. 1855, ii. 441.
20. *torisme*. 1718 *B*.
21. *toriste*. 1718 De Cize, *Hist. du Whigisme*, 211.
22. *tory*. 1687 *MLR*.
23. *whig*. 1687 *MLR*.
24. *whigisme*. 8711 *B*.

The words of this first series are not dead, of course; they are used in French as in English in reference to the history of England. They may have more life than one might at first be inclined to suppose. *Rump*, for instance, was inserted in Bescherelle's *Dictionnaire national* from

its first edition in 1845; but in French it is perhaps most often rendered by the translation *croupion*. From *parlement* *croupion* to *chambre croupion* is but a step, and I cull from the French press two interesting instances of this use:

1917. *Écho de Paris*, 3 Jan.: 'La menace, du reste, de convoquer la chambre-croupion . . . est expressément formulée dans la dernière note du gouvernement royal.'

1917. *Télégramme*, 11 Jan.: 'On peut se demander si le conseil d'état nommé et qui n'est déjà qu'un conseil d'état croupion . . . aura assez d'autorité pour donner une solution à la question de l'armée.'

My second series of political terms comprise those which always refer to England and English life, those, in other words, which continue to be part of the English political and administrative vocabulary but do not form part of the French:

25. *acte*. 1669 *MLR*.
26. *alderman*. 1688 *B.*
27. *allégeance*. 1688 *B.*
28. *amirauté*. 1687 *Miège*.
29. *banc* (du roi, &c.). 1687 *Miège*.
30. *baronnet*. 1669 *B.*
31. *bill*. 1669 *B.*
32. *bill d'attainder*. 1704 *Clarendon*, i. 315.
33. *consort*. 1669 *B.*
34. *constable*. 1777 *B* (*connétable* used in the same sense from 1687 *MLR*).
35. *coroner*. 1688 *B.*
36. *corporation*. 1672 *B.*
37. *country-gentleman*¹.

¹ *B* quotes a passage of a letter of Lamartine dated 20th May 1827 as his earliest instance of *country-gentleman* in French. It is older:

1822 Chateaubriand, *Corresp.*, ed. L. Thomas, iii. 62: 'Le parti des country-gentlemen a fait triompher l'opposition.'

1760 Lyttleton, *Dialogues des Morts* (transl. by J. des Champs), p. 28: 'Votre Sir Roger de Coverly, votre Will Honeycomb, votre country-gentleman dans le *Freeholder* et vingt autres caractères tracés le plus finement et le plus plaisamment du monde dans vos pièces'.

Dr. Doris Gunnell has kindly examined for me the French translation of the *Freeholder*:

1727 *Le Freeholder, ou l'Anglois jaloux de sa liberté*, traduit de l'anglois. Amsterdam, Uitwerf, in 12:—

There *Country-gentleman* is rendered by *gentilhomme de campagne* in all cases but one; on p. 373 an *English country gentleman* is rendered by *un gentilhomme campagnard anglois*. It would be interesting to know if the Fr. *gentilhomme campagnard*, which appears to be noted for the first time in a dictionary by the Trévoux of 1771, is originally a translation of *country-gentleman*.

38. *échiquier*. 1704 Clarendon, ii. 79 : 'chancelier de l'échiquier'.
 39. *esquire*. 1669 *B*.
 40. *gentleman*. 1558 *B*: 'gentilleman'. 1698 *B*: 'gentleman'.
 41. *gentry*. 1688 *B*.
 42. *habeas corpus*. 1700 *Nouv. de la République des lettres*, Sept. p. 250.
 43. *lady*. 1669 *B*.
 44. *lord*. 1558 *B*.
 45. *lord lieutenant* (d'Irlande). 1704 Clarendon, ii. 19.
 46. *lord maire*. 1688 *B*.
 47. *milady*. 1727 *B*.
 48. *milord*. Fourteenth century.
 49. *miss*. 1713 *B*.
 50. *mistress*. 1776 *B*.
 51. *nobleman*. 1698 *B*.
 52. *pairesse*. 1698 *B*.
 53. *queen*. 1688 *B*.
 54. *recorder*. 1656 *B* Suppl.
 55. *sheriff*. 1687 *MLR*.¹
 56. *sir*. 1687 *MLR*.
 57. *solliciteur*. 1687 *MLR*.
 58. *solliciteur-général*. 1704 *MLR*.
 59. *sous-sheriff*. 1687 *MLR*.
 60. *speaker*. 1649 *B*.
 61. *steward*. 1669 *B*.
 62. *warrant*. 1671 *B*.
 63. *writ*. 1702 *B*.

My third series is made up of those terms which have become part of the French political, administrative, and judicial vocabulary. In many respects they are particularly interesting; they are of course less easy to detect because they have donned a purely French form. In fact, the form of many of them is not new in French; what is new, what comes from England, is the meaning. The great majority of them, when used in French before the Revolution of 1789, refer only to England, its institutions and political habits. Since that date, as they come to indicate institutions and habits in France, they are no longer felt as having a foreign origin. I cannot pretend to give a complete list; but it is as complete as I can at the present make it:

64. *adresse*. 1687 *MLR*.
 65. *agitateur*. 1687 *MLR* (hence *agiter*, *agitation* in a political sense).

¹ For sixteenth-century use of *sheriff* in French, cf. *Corresp. polit. d O. de Selve*, ed. Lefèvre-Pontalis, p. 141: 'Le scheray d'Ayr'; and again p. 257: 'Avec le mayre, cheruvez et aldrementz de ceste ville (Londres)'.

66. *ajournement*. 1771 *Dict. de Trévoux*.

67. *ajourner*. 1704 Clarendon, ii. 108.

68. *assise* (in the modern sense in *cours d'assises* 'courts to try criminal cases').

69. *coalition*. 1718 De Cize, *Hist. du Whigisme*, 294: 'On avoit parlé d'une *coalition* dans le ministère, c'est à dire, d'un mélange de whigs et de toris.' For later eighteenth century cases, see *MLR*.

70. *comité*. 1656 *B.*

71. *commission* (parlementaire). 1704 Clarendon, i. 334, 392.

72. *constitution* (du gouvernement). 1704 Clarendon, i. 16, 19, &c.

73. *convention*. 1709 *MLR*.

74. *débats* (parlementaires). 1704 Clarendon, i.

75. *dissolution* (du parlement). 1704 Clarendon, ii. 46.

76. *dissoudre*. 1709 *MLR*.

77. *exécutif*. 1762 *MLR*.

78. *fédératif*. 1748 *MLR*.

79. *influence*. 1704 Clarendon, i. 332: 'L'influence qu'ils avoient dans la chambre des Communes'.

80. *influencer*. 1787 *MLR*.

81. *jugé de paix*. 1687 *MLR*.¹

82. *juré*, 'juryman, juror'. 1687 Miège: 'jury, les *jurez*'.

83. *jury*, 1688 *B.*²

84. *législatif*. 1700 *MLR*.

85. *législature*. 1745 *MLR*.³

86. *liste civile*. 1769 Grenville, *Tableau de l'Angleterre*, 87: 'La liste civile est le revenu qui appartient personnellement au roi. A son avènement à la couronne, le Parlement, dans sa première session, l'assigne pour toute la durée de son règne.'

87. *majorité*. 1760 *MLR*.

88. *marital*. In *cour martiale*, 1771 *Dict. de Trévoux*, v. 861: 'En Angleterre on appelle *cour martiale* le conseil de guerre établi pour juger la conduite des généraux, des amiraux'; and in *loi martiale*.⁴

¹ Cf. 1546 *Corresp. d'Odèt de Selve*, ed. Lefèvre-Pontalis, p. 55 (Selve's letter is dated London, Nov. 10). 'Il feust avant hyer commandé tant au mayre de ceste ville qu'à certains autres magistratz nommés *justices à paix* qui ont leur juridictions divisées par les provinces de ce royaume de s'enquerir secrètement de tous ceux qui tenoient propos de trahison.' In 1687 Miège translates 'justice of the peace' by *justicier* or *jugé de paix*. Isolated instances of *jugé à paix* occur.

² When the jury was instituted in France in 1791 (law of Sept. 16) the *grand jury* and the *petty jury* became the *jury d'accusation* (suppressed in 1810) and the *jury de jugement*.

³ In addition to the instances of *législature* in the eighteenth-century French texts quoted in the *MLR*, it may be noted that the word occurs several times in the 1769 translation of Grenville, *Tableau de l'Angleterre*, e. g. pp. 124, 125, 131.

⁴ In France *la loi martiale* was promulgated on the 21st Oct. 1789. The *cours martiales* were instituted by the decree of the 22nd Sept. 1790 and suppressed by the law of the 10th April 1793.

89. *meeting*. 1786 *B*.
 90. *membre*. 1687 Miège: 'Member of parliament. *Un membre de parlement*.'

91. *message*. 1704 Clarendon, ii. 102.
 92. *minorité*. 1793 *MLR*. 1727 *Le Freeholder*, &c. p. 77: 'Il n'y a pas même, de mémoire d'homme une minorité, où elles n'aient été souvent rebatues.'¹

93. *motion*. 1793 *Débats de la Convention nationale*, ed. 1828, iii. 80.
 94. *opposition*. 1745 Abbé Leblanc, *Lettres d'un François*.
 95. *ordre*. 1787 *MLR*.
 96. *parlement*. 1666 *B*.
 97. *parlementaire*. 1644 St. Amant, *Albion*, in *Œuvres*, ed. 1855, ii. 442: 'Messieurs les parlementaires . . .'
 98. *pétition*. 1704 Clarendon, i. 410: 'Pétition de droit'.
 99. *pétitionner*. 1792 *DG*.
 100. *prorogation*. 1687 *MLR*.
 101. *proroger*. 1687 *MLR*.
 102. *quorum*. 1688 *B*.
 103. *représentatif*.
 104. *septennial*. 1723 *B*. Mandeville (transl. by Juste van Effen), *Pensées libres sur la religion*, &c., 440: 'En se plaignant de l'acte septennial . . .' *Septennial* was inserted into the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* in 1762.
 105. *session*. 1657 *B* (in sense of 'quarter-sessions'). 1709 *MLR* (in sense of 'session' of Parliament).
 106. *verdict*. 1669 *B*.
 107. *vote*. 1704 *MLR*.
 108. *voter*. 1704 *MLR*.

My list of historical terms is particularly incomplete, as the following notes will show:

109. *bourg corrompu*. 1793 T. Paine, *Rec. de divers écrits*, 252: 'Les corporations et les bourgs corrompus . . .'; more commonly *bourg pourri*; equivalents of the E. *rotten borough*.
 110. *freeholder*. 1727 (See note on *country-gentleman*) and its translation *franc-tenancier*.
 111. *leveller*. 1709 Clarendon, vi. 336.
 112. *loyaliste*. 1701 *Nouv. de la Républ. des Lettres*, Aug., 203: 'Les noms de haut et de bas clergé, de conformistes et de fanatiques, de whigs et de tories, de loyalistes ou royalistes et de rebelles, furent le fruit de la politique de Charles II . . .'
 113. *majesté du peuple*. 1745 *MLR*.

¹ Cf. the English text: 'A stale accusation which has been used by every minority in the memory of man.'

114. *non-jurant*. 1718 De Cize. *Hist. du Whigisme*, 240: 'Les catholiques anglois et les non-jurants . . .'
 115. *non-jureur*. 1708 *Nouv. de la Républ. des Lettres*, April, 477: 'M. Lesley, ci-devant chanoine de la cathédrale de Connor, et à présent non-jureur . . .'
 116. *shipmoney*. 1704 Clarendon, i. 90, 91.

To the American War of Independence may be traced:

117. *congrès*. 1776 *MLR* (and its derivatives).
 118. *fédéral*. 1793 T. Paine, *Rec. de div. écrits*, 307: 'Les dépenses du gouvernement fédéral des États-Unis de l'Amérique . . .'¹

II

That English had a very marked influence on the French religious vocabulary at the end of the seventeenth century seems to me certain, but the question is not sufficiently elucidated for very definite results to be given. Words that had been used in the sixteenth century gained new life at the end of the seventeenth from the religious controversies of the time, and are common only from that date. Such are *papiste* (1539 *DG*) and *papisme* (1578 *DG*); English influence is seen formally in the common use of *papistique* and the occasional use of *papistical* in the eighteenth century. Such is *catholicisme* (1598 *MLR*) which becomes common from about 1685 and is accepted by the Académie in 1762. Such again are *jésuitique* and *jésuitisme*; an early instance of *jésuitique* occurs in 1610 in *Anti-cotton*, ed. 1738, p. 134: 'Le dernier article sent du tout la veine et les termes jésuitiques'; but both *jésuitique* and *jésuitisme* make their way about 1700 in texts of English origin, such as:

1709. *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, May, p. 571: 'Un ministre de l'église anglicane, nommé Jean Agate, ayant épousé son lieu commun d'injures contre les non-conformistes, s'est enfin avisé de les accuser de jésuitisme, dans un écrit intitulé *The Plain Truth* . . .'
 1718. De Cize, *Hist. du Whigisme*, p. 117: 'Il y eut quatre évêques qui servirent d'instruments à la cabale jésuitique . . .'

¹ The words derived from *fédéral*: *fédéraliser*, *fédéralisme*, *fédéraliste* were in constant use in 1792 and 1793, and were inserted in the *Dict. de l'Académie* in 1798. *Fédéral* itself was not officially accepted till 1835. *Fédéraliser* in the same year was officially suppressed. For *fédéralisation* which has never been accepted, cf.:

1794 *La Société des Jacobins*, *Rec. de Documents*, publ. by F. Aulard, vi. 578: 'La loi du 14 frimaire contient une disposition expresse qui défend aucune fédéralisation, aucune centralisation . . .'

and it is noticeable that they were not officially admitted to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* till 1835.¹

A curious case is that of *anti-chrétien* and *anti-christianisme*. The *DG* quotes as earliest instances of these French words the forms *antichristien*, *antichristiansme* which occur in a translation from G. Thompson of 1602. The same authority derives the Fr. *anti-chrétien* from *anti-* (ἀντί) and *chrétien*; but it should be noted that originally, and in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries most often, E. *antichristian* is derived from *antichrist* and not a compound of *anti-* and *christian*, and it is quite probable that 'of Antichrist' is the meaning of *antichristien* in the text quoted by the *DG*. Miège, for instance, in 1687, renders E. *antichristian* by Fr. *de l'antéchrist* and by that only. The first instance I can quote of the modern form *anti-chrétien* is the following :

1704. Clarendon, ii. 70 : 'On ne frequentoit plus les églises épiscopales, mais les lieux où l'on prechoit contre elles, comme anti-chrétiennes . . .'

and here the introduction of the hyphen suggests that the translator felt the word as a compound of *anti-* and *chrétien*.

The following religious terms have an English source :

- 119. *barrouste*. 1684 *MLR*.
- 120. *basse église*. 1718 De Cize, *Hist. du Whigisme* p. 21.
- 121. *broumiste*. 1684 *MLR*.
- 122. *conformiste*. 1687 *MLR*.
- 123. *conformité*. 1687 *MLR*.²
- 124. *convocation*. 1704 Clarendon, i. 192 : 'La convocation ou assemblée du clergé . . .'
- 125. *dissenter*. 1687 *MLR*.
- 126. *fanatique* (as applied to the non-conformists). 1687 Miège.
- 127. *fanatisme*. 1699 *DG*.
- 128. *haute église*. 1718 De Cize, *Hist. du Whigisme* p. 21.
- 129. *indépendant*. 1684 *MLR*.
- 130. *indépendantisme*. 1708 *MLR*.
- 131. *lollard*. 1708 *Nouv. de la Républ. des Lettres*, Jan., p. 5 : 'Wiclf ayant traduit la Bible en anglois, plusieurs furent

¹ The title-page of the first edition of the English translation of *Les Provinciales* is: 'Les Provinciales or, The Mysterie of Jesuitisme discover'd in certain letters . . . London. Printed by J.G. for R. Royston . . . 1657.'

² *Conformité*, *convocation*, *fanatique*, &c., are of course older in French in their general sense; they are only semantic loan-words; each of them is enriched by a new meaning from English. *Fanatisme* has not been found before 1699; cf. :

1707 (le père Catrou), *Histoire du fanatisme dans la religion protestante*. . .
1718 De Cize, *Hist. du Whigisme*, p. 242 : 'Sa majesté, my lord thresorier, Marlborough, le sevèques même l'avoient quittée et embrassé le fanaticisme . . .'

portez par cette lecture à secouer le joug de l'église romaine et on leur donna le nom de lollards . . .

132. *non-conformiste*. 1687 *MLR*.
 133. *non-conformité*. 1687 *MLR*.
 134. *non-résistance*. 1701 *MLR*.
 135. *obéissance passive*. 1687 *Miège*.
 136. *panthéisme*. 1712 *B*.
 137. *panthéiste*. 1712 *B*.
 138. *papistique*. 1704 *MLR*.
 139. *presbytérianisme*. 1704 *Clarendon*, i. 112.
 140. *presbytérien*. 1684 *MLR*.
 141. *puritain*. 1687 *MLR*.
 142. *puritanisme*. 1691 *DG*.
 143. *quaker*. 1657 *B Suppl.*
 144. *quakeresse*. 1734 *B* at *quaker*.
 145. *quakérisme*. 1701 *MLR*.
 146. *ranter*. 1687 *MLR*.
 147. *robinsonien*. 1774 *Grosley, Londres* (ed. 2) ii. 370-1: [Les séparatistes] qui, s'étant divisés en *rigides* et *mitigés*, sous les noms de *brunistes* et de *robinsoniens*, se réunirent ensuite sous la dénomination commune d'*Indépendans*.
 148. *séparatiste*. 1684 *MLR*.
 149. *théisme*. 1756 *DG*.
 150. *théiste*. 1705 *MLR*.
 151. *trembleur* (transl. of *quaker*). 1669 *DG*.

To this list may be added:

152. *ami* (= 'quaker'). 1803 *Volney, Tabl. des États-Unis*, in *Œuvres*, ed. 1821, vii. 390: 'La bienfaisante société des Amis'.
 153. *méthodiste*. 1770 *Grosley, Londres*, ed. 1774, ii. 331: 'Les méthodistes, quoique les derniers en date parmi les non-conformistes, ont à côté de leur tabernacle, un cimetière . . .'

III

I propose to divide the words relating to English life in general which are found in French texts of 1685 to 1815 into five groups, according as they relate to (i) food, (ii) drink, (iii) dress, (iv) games and sports, (v) other matters.

To Group (i) belong:

154. *beefsteak, bifteck*. 1786 *B*: *beefstakes*.
 155. *bread pudding*. 1762 *B*.
 156. *chester*. 1714-26 *Le Spectateur ou le Socrate moderne*, ii. 310: 'fromage de Cheshire'. 1762 *MLR*: 'fromage de Chester'.

157. *pannequet*. 1808 *B.*
 158. *pie*. 1698 *B.*
 159. *plum pudding*. 1745 *MLR.*
 160. *pudding*. 1687 *MLR.*
 161. *rosbif*. 1727 *MLR.* *rôt de bœf*. 1698 *B.*
 162. *sandwich*. 1801 *B.* (Cf. *MLR*).

To Group (ii):

163. *bishop*. 1808 *B.*
 164. *bitter*. 1803 Volney, *Tabl. des États-Unis*, in *Œuvres*, ed. 1821, vii. 284: 'Le remède qui plaît le plus à ces malades, est celui qu'ils appellent *bitters*, les *amers*, dont l'eau-de-vie, le rhum, ou le vin de Madère sont la base.'
 165. *bol*. 1653 *B* *bolleponge*. 1701 *DG* ait. *bouleponche*. 1760 Lyttleton, *Dial. des Morts*, p. 200: 'Il y a un punch de rum et un punch d'arrak. . . . Jupiter auroit donné tout son nectar pour un bowl de l'un ou de l'autre . . .'
 166. *brandy*. 1688 *B.*
 167. *claret*. 1762 *MLR.*
 168. *gin*. 1802 *B.*
 169. *grog*. 1785 *B.*
 170. *guildive*. 1722 *DG* (the form *guildine* is a misprint).¹
 171. *porter*. 1770 *MLR.*
 172. *posset*. 1687 *Miège.*
 173. *punch*. 1653 *B*: *bolleponge*.
 174. *toddy*. 1698 *B.*
 175. *whiskey*. 1770 *MLR.*

Group (iii) contains the following six words:

176. *cadogan*, *catogan*. 1780 *B.*²
 177. *carrick*. 1805 *B.*³
 178. *frac* considered by the *DG* of unknown origin. In the early instances of the word, that I am acquainted with, it is used

¹ *Guildive* is a West Indian word, and corrupted from the E. *kill-devil* (perhaps through a spoken *kill-dv'l*), attested by the *OED* from 1651; cf. Dutch *keel duvel*, Dan. *geldyvel* etc. A French form *gueldivine* is given in 1799 by Nemnich.

² The first instance of the corresponding English word *cadogan* given by the *OED* is of about 1780. This is curious, as the Lord Cadogan who is supposed to have started the fashion of tying his hair in a cadogan knot died in 1726.

³ *Carrick* is not given by the *OED* either as the name of a garment or as that of a stuff. It is impossible to admit that this word is taken from the name of the Scotchman John Carrick (1787-1837), and most unlikely that it should be derived from that of the actor David Garrick. *B* has found an example of *carrick* as the name of a stuff in the 1656 translation by S. Laurens, *Un subside accordé au roy*, ii. 6: 'Courte pièce de telleils appelle Carrick . . .'. It seems probable that ultimately Carrick is the name of the place where the stuff was made. But the history of the word is still fragmentary.

in reference to England and the English. I am inclined to think it is an oral borrowing from E. *frock*, quoted by the *OED* in the required sense from 1719. 1767 Beaumarchais, *Eugénie in Théâtre*, ed. 1869, i. 49: 'Habillement des personnages . . . Sir Charles: un fracq de drap bleu de roi à revers de même étoffe . . .'¹

179. *legging*. 1803 Volney, *Tabl. des États-Unis*, in *Oeuvres*, ed. 1821, vii. 384: 'Les cuisses et les jambes tantôt nues, tantôt garnies d'une longue guêtre d'étoffe. En anglais *leggins* (jambières).'²

180. *redingote*. 1725 *B*.

181. *spencer*. 1801-2 *B*. A little older example than that given by *B* is the following: 1802 Delille, *Épître à deux enfants voyageurs*, in *Oeuvres*, ed. 1817, iv. 548:

Il ne sort pas sans un spencer,
Ne ht que Milton et Chaucer . . .³

In Group (iv) are the following:

182. *boston*. 1785 *Journal de Paris*, suppl. Dec. 27, p. 1498: 'almanach des Jeux, ou Académie portative, contenant les règles du réversis, du wisk, du piquet, du trictrac, du wisk bostonien, du mayland et du tressette. Nouvelle édition.'

183. *boulingrin*. 1663 *MLR*: 'poulingrin'.

184. *boxe*. 1792 *B*.

185. *boxer*. 1779 *B*.

186. *boxeur*. 1788 Mercier, *Tableau de Paris*, xi. 162.

187. *chelem*. 1789 *MLR*.

188. *contre-danse*. 1626 *DG*.

189. *crabs*, *creps*, &c. 1789 *DG*.⁴

¹ Grimm, *Deutsches Wb.*, would derive Germ. *Frack* from Polish. The instances he gives of Germ. *Frack* are all later than the early French ones of *frac*. [Kluge (*Etym. Wb.*) considers *Frack* to be from Eng. *frock*, comparing the eighteenth-century Ger. *boxen* 'to box'. The F. *frac* he thinks to be from the German, on the ground that it is not recorded so early; but this appears to be a mistake.—*Ed.*]

² *B* gives instances of *legging* in 1860, 1869, and 1898; cf.

1916 *La Vie parisienne*, 11 Nov., p. 850: 'Leggings de tous modèles en véritable peau de porc.'

But a spelling *leggin* is fairly popular and has received the approbation of the *Petit Larousse de poche*; cf.:

1917 *Le Temps*, Jan. 15: 'Les moins sportifs des Parisiens portaient leggings et souliers de chasse.'

³ The above text from Delille dates from his stay in England, and is therefore anterior to 1800. The first instances of E. *spencer* in the required sense given by the *OED* is dated 1796. The garment derives its name not from the Lord Spencer who died in 1845 as stated by the *DG* and by *B*, but from the 2nd Earl, George John Spencer (1758-1834).

⁴ The name of this dice game occurs as *krabs*, *craps*, and even as *crespe*. For this last form, cf. :

1790 *Journal du duc de Chartres*, Nov. 26, in *Corresp. de Louis Philippe Joseph d'Orléans*, &c., 1800, p. 231: 'Après le dîner, on a commencé par jouer au crespe . . .'

190. *football*. 1698 *B.* (This is no doubt an isolated instance; I know of no other before 1815.)

191. *foxhunter*. 1745 *MLR*.¹

192. *gigue*. 1650.

193. *honneur*. 1789 *Acad. Univ. des Jeux*, ii. 324: 'Les adversaires paient . . . les honneurs comme au whisk . . .'

194. *hunter*. 1802 *B.*

195. *jockey*. 1775 De Frenais, transl. *Tristram Shandy*, in Sterne, *Oeuvres*, ed. 1803, iii. 214: 'Mais cette affaire est du ressort des jockeis . . .'

196. *maryland* (card-game). 1785 (see *boston*, no. 182).

197. *paddock*. 1708 *B.*

198. *partner, partenaire*. 1767 *B.*

199. *ranelagh*. 1760 Lyttleton, *Dial. des Morts*, p. 302: 'Dites-moi, je vous prie, Mercure, si vous n'avez pas là-bas un beau vauxhall ni un ranelagh.'

200. *self defence*. 1745 Abbé le Blanc, *Lettres d'un François*, iii. 8: 'Moi, George Bishop, maître de la noble science de défense dans toutes ses branches . . .'²

201. *singleton*. 1789 *MLR*.

202. *vauxhall*. 1714-26 *Le Spectateur ou le Socrate moderne*, ed. 1737, iv. 132: 'Après que mon vieux ami se fut assis dans le bateau . . . nous voguâmes vers Fox-Hall.' For its use as a common noun, see text at *ranelagh*.

203. *whisk*. 1714 *Le Spectateur ou le Socrate moderne*, ed. 1737, i. 369: 'Quelquefois ils s'éflechissent avec étonnement sur certaines parties au whisk, qui ont été gagnées par quelques-uns de leurs membres, lorsqu'il n'y avoit presque plus d'espérance.'

204. *whist*. 1687 Miège: 'whist, sorte de jeu de cartes.'

The miscellaneous Group (v) comprises the following words:

205. *baby, bébé*. 1704 *MLR*.

206. *bedlam*. 1704 Clarendon, ii. 98: 'Mais c'étoient des fous qu'il falloit envoyer à bedlam . . .'

207. *boarding-school*. 1779 *B.*

208. *box* (at the theatre). 1777 *B.*

209. *by god!* 1789 *B.*

210. *caronnade*. 1783 *DG.*

¹ The word *foxhunting* is not found in our period in its English form, but translated as *chasse du renard*.

² Cf.: 1754 (Swift), *Hist. de John Bull*, p. 63: 'A Lewis Baboon, maître dans la noble science de la défense'. For the English form, *B* only quotes from 1889; cf. c. 1866 A. Esquiroz, *L'Angleterre et la Vie anglaise*, 4th S., p. 106: 'Il donnait aux provinciaux ébahis une représentation du noble art de *self defence* (défense de soi-même) . . .'

211. *club* 1702 *B*. During the eighteenth century the word *coterie* was used in 1714 by the translator of *The Spectator*, and it is often found as the equivalent of *club*.¹

212. *coachman*. 1790 *MLR*.

213. *cockney*. 1804 *B*.

214. *convict*. 1802 *B*.

215. *fellow*. 1804 *B*.

216. *franc-maçon*. 1740 *B*: 'frimaçon'.

217. *franc-maçonnerie*. 1742 *B*: 'franche-maçonnerie'.

218. *goddam*. 1766 *MLR*.

219. *groom*. 1669 *B* (an isolated instance; I know of no other example before 1815).

220. *home*. 1807 *B*.

221. *horseguard*. 1792 *B*.

222. *hurrah, hourra*. 1770 *Grosley, Londres*, ed. 1774, i. 158; 'La canaille... exigea qu'ils la saluassent du fouet et du chapeau, en criant *ourey*: cii de ralliement dans toutes les bagarres.'

223. *huzza*. 1726 *Le Spectateur, &c.*, ed. 1737, vi. 290: 'La quatrième dame... fut introduite au bruit des huzzas de tous ceux qui l'avoient aimée autrefois...'

224. *john bull*. 1753 *B*.

225. *loge* (of freemasons). 1740 *B*.

226. *mail-coach*. 1802 *B*.

227. *minstrel*. 1801 *B*.

228. *office*. 1786 *B*.

229. *overseer*. 1773 *B*.

230. *parlour*. 1687 Letter in *Misson, Voyage d'Italie*, ed. 1722, i. 172: 'Une petite sale chez les gens du commun, ce que vousappelez *parlour* en Angleterre...'

231. *penny post*. 1687 *MLR*.

232. *pickpocket*. 1792 *B*.

233. *poker*. 1802 J. Delille, *Épître à deux enfants voyageurs in Œuvres*, ed. 1817, iv. 547: 'Ne manque pas de faire l'emplette de l'infatigable poker.' A note is added: 'Tient lieu de la pincette.'²

¹ *Clubiste* was accepted by the Academy in 1798. *B* quotes no earlier instances. Cf. 1791 *Société des Jacobins, Rec. de Documents*, publ. by F. Aulard, ii. 243: 'Tous les prétendus amis de l'humanité, tous ces clubistes, s'emparèrent de toutes les presses.'

² *B* gives instances of *poker* in this sense only from 1857. As a matter of fact it occurs fairly commonly in the first half of the nineteenth century, and the text from Delille is earlier than 1800; cf.:

1823 Arcieu, *Diorama de Londres*, p. 139: 'Ils sont gourmés et raides, ainsi qu'on le dit en Angleterre, comme s'ils avaient avalé le poker.' Cf. p. 290. 1830-1 W. Scott, tr. by Defauconpret, ed. 1839, i. (*Waverley*) 411: 'De la main droite il brandissait un poker.'

1836 C. G. Simon, *Obs. rec. en Angleterre en 1835*, i. 190 n.

1848 T. Gautier, *Partie carrée*, p. 126: 'Saunders donna quelques coups de pocket (*sic!*) dans la masse à demi consumée du charbon de terre...'

234. *public-house*. 1786 *B*.
 235. *raout, rout*. 1802 J. Dehille, *Épître à deux enfants voyageurs*, in *Oeuvres*, ed. 1817, iv. 548: 'Du nom de rout il appelle nos bals . . .'
 236. *rickets*. 1687 *MLR*.
 237. *square*. 1687 *MLR*: 'place carrée'. *Square* from 1770.
 238. *toast*. 1745 *MLR*: 'toste'.
 239. *toaster*. 1745 *MLR*: 'toster'.
 240. *watchman*. 1770 Grosley, *Londres*, ed. 1774, i. 141: 'Trois (guinées) pour l'impôt sur les fenêtres, balayeurs et ouachmen'.

IV

In Section IV I deal with (i) terms of finance and taxation; (ii) commercial terms and names of articles of trade; (iii) names of weights and measures.

In (i) are to be placed:

241. *additionnel*. 1769 Grenville, *Tableau de l'Angleterre*, p. 80: 'droits additionnels'; p. 15: 'les trois pour cent additionnels'; p. 60: 'taxe additionnelle'.¹
 242. *bank-note*. 1804 Arthur O'Connor, *État actuel de la Grande Bretagne*, p. 39 n.: 'Je ne donne (ces sommes) que dans l'intention de faire sentir l'effet indirect de ces banknotes sur la multiplication du papier.'
 243. *budget*. 1764 *DG*.
 244. *consolidés*. 1768 *B*.
 245. *dette publique*. 1769 Grenville, *Tabl. de l'Angl.*, p. 33: 'État de la dette publique à la conclusion de la paix. . .'; Cf. also *dette fondée*: 1769 Grenville, *Tabl. de l'Angl.*, p. 69, and later *dette flottante*.
 246. *excise*. 1650 *B Suppl.*
 247. *income-tax*. 1801 *B*.
 248. *land-tax*. 1815 Pillet, *L'Angl. vue à Londres*, p. 121.
 249. *omnium*. 1793 *B*.
 250. *papier-monnaie*. 1790 *MLR*.
 251. *pondage*. 1656 *B*.
 252. *poor-rate*. Cf. 1770 Grosley, *Londres*, ed. 1774, i. 141: 'deux (guinées) pour la taxe des pauvres'. 1815 Pillet, *L'Angl. vue à Londres*, p. 121: 'Après ces taxes, vient la taxe des pauvres, comme sous le nom de *poors rate* . . .'
 253. *scrip*. 1793 *B* at art. *omnium*.
 254. *stock-exchange*. 1802 *B*.

¹ Cf. 1723 *Mém. de M. Marais*, ed. de Lescure, iii. 39: 'Lui s'appeloit Nicolas etc. La Reynie étoit un nom additionnel.' Here *additionnel* may be a F. derivative in *-el* fr. *addition*. It is the only instance I know of before 1769.

255. *tonnage*. 1656 *B.*

In (ii) we have:

256. *batten*. 1802 *B.*

257. *bloom*. 1774 *B.*

258. *calicot*. 1792 Yiwine, *Voy. à la mer Rouge*, i. 106: 'Les marchandises furent rembarquées, mais il y manquait une balle de calicot.' Parraud, the translator, adds a note: 'Toile de coton des Indes . . .'. 1835 Acad.: *calicot*.

259. *casimir*. 1825 *Revue britannique*, i. 214: 'draps, casimirs et mérinos, serges, shalls . . .'¹

260. *châle*. 1791 *MLR*.²

261. *compétition*. 1787 Féraud, *Dict. crit.*, quoting from Targe: 'Afin que le commerce put fleurir sans compétition'.

262. *crown-glass*. 1783 *B.*

263. *drilling*. 1802 *B.*

264. *exportation*. 1740 *DG.*

265. *exporter*. 1771 *DG.* (The compound *réexporter* occurs in 1760: Savary des Bruslons, *Dict. du Comm.*, ii. 114: L'importation des denrées étrangères, soit pour les consommer, soit pour les réexporter.

266. *fire-clay*. 1780 *B.*

267. *flanelle*. 1656 *B.*

268. *flint-glass*. 1771 *B.*

269. *gourgouran*. 1723 *DG.*

270. *importation*. 1748 *DG.*

271. *importer*. 1762 *DG.*

272. *isinglass*. 1803 Volney, *Tabl. des États-Unis*, in *Œuvres*, ed. 1821, vii. 51: 'Une veine de granit-talqueux ou isinglass'.

273. *kennets*. 1761 Savary des Bruslons, *Dict. du Comm.*, iii. 469: 'Kennets, mot anglois, dont on appelle une sorte de drap grossier, qu'on fabrique dans la province de Galles.'

274. *malt*. 1712 *B.*

275. *maryland* (tobacco). 1762 Savary des Bruslons, *Dict. du Comm.*, iv. 870: 'Tabac du Maryland'.

276. *mohair*. 1650 *B.*

¹ *Casimir*, as the name of a stuff, was accepted by the academy in 1835. I take it to be the E. *cassimere*, attested in 1704 as the name of Cashmere, and from 1774 as the name of a stuff (see *OED*). The *OED* cannot quote the E. *cashmere* as the name of a stuff till 1822; for Fr. *cachemire* in a text of 1791, see *MLR*. The history of stuff names is often obscure and that of *cachemire*, *casimir* is no exception. Considering the date at which E. *cashmere* is attested, I do not put *cachemire* in my list.

² M. Bonnaffé, with whom I have had some correspondence on Anglicisms, is very doubtful as to whether *châle* was borrowed by French directly from the dialects of India or came in through English. The spelling of the word in the two earliest texts I know, and which I have noted in the *MLR*, appears to me favourable to the hypothesis of English influence; these texts are of 1791 and 1793, and the 1793 text is a translation from English.

277. *moire*. 1639 *B*.
 278. *paddy*. 1785 *B*.
 279. *peniston, paniston*. 1687 *Arrêt du 20 déc.*, quoted by Savary des Bruslons, *Dict. du Comm.*, iv. 125: 'Les penistons payent en France les droits à raison de 24 liv. la pièce de 15 aunes.'¹
 280. *reps*. 1835 *Acad.* The word is certainly older, but I can quote no instance.
 281. *worsted*. 1656 *B*.

To (iii) belong:

282. *acre*.
 283. *barrel*. 1759 Savary des Bruslons.
 284. *bushel*. 1774 *B*.
 285. *carolus*. 1687 *M*.
 286. *carnok*. 1759 *Sav*.
 287. *chelin, schelling, shilling*. 1558 *B*: 'chelin'.
 288. *comb, combe*. 1759 *Sav*.
 289. *couronne, crown*. 1759 *Sav*.
 290. *cubit*. 1759 *Sav*.
 291. *demi-couronne*. 1759 *Sav*.
 292. *fardin, farthing*. 1558 *B*: 'fardin'.
 293. *fathom*. 1759 Bellin, *Ess. géogr.*, i. 162.
 294. *firkin*. 1687 Miège s.v. *barril*: 'Le firkin est la moitié du kilderkin'.
 295. *furlong*. 1760 *Sav*.
 296. *gallon*. 1687 *M* s.v. *barrel*.
 297. *guinée*. 1669 *B*.
 298. *half-penny*. 1762 Savary des Bruslons, *Dict. du Comm.*, iv. 125: 'Le demi-denier ou half-peny est de cuivie.'
 299. *hide*. 1759-62 *Sav*.
 300. *hogshead*. 1759-62 *Sav*.
 301. *inch*. 1759-62 *Sav*.
 302. *jacobus*. 1687 *M*.
 303. *kilderkin*. 1687 *M*.
 304. *lest*. 1759-62 *Sav*.
 305. *load*. 1671 *B*.
 306. *peck*. 1759-62 *Sav*.
 307. *penny*. 1558 *B*: 'peni'.
 308. *pound*. 1765 *B*.
 309. *quarte*. 1687 *M*. s.v. *gallon*.
 310. *quarter*. 1762 *B* Suppl.
 311. *rod*. 1803 Volney, *Tabl. des États-Unis*, in *Œuvres*, 1821, vii. 49: A la distance de quarante rod (deux cents mètres).

¹ E. *peniston* from *Peniston* (W. Riding of Yorkshire) attested as the name of a stuff from 1551-2, *OED*.

312. *rood*. *Dict. de Trévoux*.

313. *stone*. 1688 *B.*

314. *yard*. 1669 *B.*

I do not include in the above list the words *aunc*, *florin*, *livre*, *mille*, *once*, *perche*, *pied*, *pouce*, although it is clear that they may have a purely English sense. Miège translates E. *acre* by F. *arpent*, E. *hogshead* by F. *muid*, E. *peck* by F. *picotin* and so on; these were only approximate equivalents, and the use in a French context of the English term was rendered necessary, both to secure exact understanding, and to avoid cumbrous combinations such as *muid d'Angleterre*.

V

In our period French naval words drawn from English are not very numerous. A difficulty arises through the fact that many of the English words that are to be considered are themselves taken from Dutch. Now French, like English, took many naval words from Dutch in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Among names of vessels or boats one can quote *acon*, *aque*, *belandre*, *boyer*, *cague*, *capre*, *chameau*, *dogre*, *dogrebot*, *heu*, *nevre*, *pinque*, *prame*, *samoreux*, *semale*, *senau*, *seuie*, *slabre* and others. In the case of naval words of Dutch origin, when they are attested in French in the seventeenth century, and particularly before 1660, it seems likely that French took them direct from Dutch. In the case of some of them, however, Dutch influence is inextricably interwoven with English. Take, for instance, E. *yacht*, from D. *jacht*. Professor Weekley quotes an isolated instance of it in a text of 1613; but it comes into common use on the return of Charles II from Holland in 1660. The first example I can quote of F. *yacht* is of 1666; so that the word came into E. and F. at about the same time. But already in a 1672 example, quoted by the *DG*, English influence on French is clear, as the allusion is to Charles II's *yacht*. Further, English influence on the later history and meanings of F. *yacht* is undeniable. In the face of such conditions, I think it right to divide my English naval loan-words into two sets: (i) those which are undeniably Dutch in origin but appear to have been much influenced by English; (ii) those for which no Dutch claim can be made.

To (i) belong:

315. *anspect, anspec.* 1694 T. Corneille, *Dict.*
 316. *ballast.* 1618 Mellema, *Den Schat der Duytscher Tale*, ed. 1630: 'ballast, gravier ou grosse arene, ballast.'¹
 317. *ballaster.* 1618 Mellema, loc. cit.: 'ballasten, ballaster, charger les navires de gravier pour les tenir en flot.'
 318. *flibot.* Ante 1628 Sully, *Econ. roy.*, iv. 316: 'Comme on approchoit la coste d'Angleterre il se mit dans un flibot, envoie les marchands rochelois l'attendre à Brestoe . . .'
 319. *semaque, smack.* 1694 T. Corneille, *Dict.*
 320. *sloop, sloupe.* 1752 *DG.*
 321. *yacht.* 1666 Text in Jal, *Abraham Duquesne*, ii. 417: 'L'armee de ces provinces (i.e. the Dutch fleet) est de quatre-vingt cinq vaisseaux . . . sans les brûlots, les yacs et les pataches d'avis.'

Group (ii) contains:

322. *brick.* 1788 *B.*
 323. *cabine.* 1777 *B.*
 324. *caiche, ketch, quaiche.* 1666 *B*: 'cache .
 325. *commodore.* 1763 *B Suppl.*
 326. *coq.* 1690 *DG.*²
 327. *coquerie.*
 328. *coqueron.* 1736 *B.*
 329. *cotre, cutter.* 1780 *B.*
 330. *coxswain.* 1751 Lediard, *Hist. nav. d'Angl.*, I. Introd. lxviii: 'Un bosseman, un aide du bosseman, un coxswain, un maître voilier et un homme pour le servir . . .'
 331. *dock.* 1671 *B.*
 332. *dranet.* 1694 *B.*
 333. *ferry-boat.* 1786 *B.*
 334. *interlope.* 1687 Miège: 'To *interlope*, faire le métier d'*interlope* . . . an *interloper*, un *interlope*.'

335. *life-boat.* 1801 *B.*
 336. *master.* 1785 *B.*
 337. *midshipman.* 1751 Lediard, *Hist. nav. d'Angl.*, I. Introd. xxx: 'Partage des prises . . . Aux midshipmen, aux aides du charpentier, du bosman et du canonnier . . . un huitième.'

338. *paquebot.* 1634 *DG* 'paquebouc'.

¹ Cf. 1590 *Brieve histqire de Virginia*, 10: 'On se pourroit servir aux navires de fer là préparé pour ballast ou contrepoids . . .' quoted by Delbouille in *Rev. de l'hist. litt. de la France*, iv. 133.

² *DG* derives *coq* 'ship's cook' from Dutch *kok*. After some hesitation I have placed *coq* in Group (ii). *Coqueron* seems difficult to explain through mod. Dutch and is easily derived from E. *cookroom*. So *coquerie* is E. *cookery* attested in the local sense of 'cooking place or kitchen' since 1598 by the *OED*. *Coq* seems to go with the other two words.

339. *presse*: 'press gang'. 1815 Pillet, *L'Angleterre vue à Londres* p. 354: 'La marine se recrute . . . par la presse; cette . . . pratique n'est connue et mise en usage qu'en Angleterre.'

340. *presser*. 1771 *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*, vi. 983: 'Presser, en termes de commerce de mer, signifie, obliger ou contraindre les équipages des bâtiments marchands à servir sur les vaisseaux de guerre. Cette manière de parler n'est guère en usage qu'en Hollande et en Angleterre.'

341. *ramberge*. 1548 *Corres. polit. d'O. de Selve*, ed. Lefèvre-Pontalis, p. 364: 'Quant aulz choses de la mer . . . se font de nouveau deux espinasses ou rubergues.' 1549 *MLR*: 'roberges.' 1552 Rabelais, iv. 1: 'ramberges'.

342. *schooner*. 1751 Raulin, translating Sloane, *Hist. de la Jamaïque*, i. 198: 'Il s'embarqua sur une de ces petites chaloupes que nous nommons ici schooner qui servent à transporter les sucre.' 1788 G. Keate, *Relation des îles Pelew*, ed. 1793, i. 128: 'M. Barker . . .aida le capitaine . . . à dessiner la coupe du bâtiment. On décida que ce seroit un schooner (goélette) . . .'¹

343. *skipper*. 1653 *B.*

344. *smogleur, smuggler*. 1779 *B.*

345. *wherry* (*houari, ouari, warie, wary, &c.*). 1671 *B.*

346. *yac, yack, jack*: 'union jack'. 1797 Lescallier, *Vocab. des termes de marine*, iii. 630: 'jack, s. m. que nous prononçons par abus *yac*. C'est un mot anglais, qui signifie le pavillon de beaupré des vaisseaux de guerre de cette nation . . .'

VI

I shall next take the words relating to various sciences in the following order: those that relate to (i) Zoology, (ii) Botany and Agriculture, (iii) Geology, Geography, Metallurgy, and Mineralogy, and (iv) Miscellaneous Subjects.

In Group (i):

347. *albatros*. 1760 *B.*

348. *alligator*. 1688 *B.*

349. *antilope*. 1764 *B.*

350. *balbuzard*. 1770 *B.*

351. *ballan* (= *labrus maculatus* Bloch) used by Bonnaterre, *Lacépède*, Bloch.

352. *baltimore*. 1775 *B Suppl.*

353. *bantam*. 1766 *B Suppl.*

¹ I quote these two instances because the *DG* has not found *schooner* in F. before 1812; Kemna (*Der Begriff 'Schiff' im Französischen*, p. 173), not before 1811; and M. Bonnaffé not before 1801.

354. *bass*. 1802 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, iv. 278. 1827 Chateaubriand, *Voy. en Amér.*, ed. Didot, 1847, p. 334: 'Le brochet, la perche, le cannelet, la basse . . .'

355. *beggo*. *Ante* 1748 in the same texts as *mandrill*. See *MLR*.

356. *bib*. 1799 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, ii. 404.

357. *bigle*. 1650 *B*.

358. *boubie*. 1751 Raulin, translating H. Sloane, *Hist. de la Jamaïque*, ii. 237-8: 'On y voit le carion-crow, espèce de corneille, la frégatte ou man of war, le booby, des hyronnelles . . .'

359. *bouledogue*. 1751 *B*.

360. *burbot* (= *lota vulgaris* Fleming).

361. *catfish*. 1803 Volney, *Oeuvres*, ed. 1821, vii. 346 n.: 'L'on y pêche (dans l'Ohio), entre autres poissons, du catfish qui pèse quatre-vingt et quatre-vingt dix livres . . .'

362. *chob, chub*. 1803 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, v. 608: 'Dans plusieurs rivières d'Europe habite le chub.'

363. *colfiche*.

364. *croker*. 1802 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, iv. 314.

365. *gonnelle, gunnelle*. The form *gonnelle* was created in 1817 by Cuvier, *Règne animal*, ed. 1829, ii. 239.

366. *greyhound*. 1614 *B*.

367. *grilse*. 1779 *B*.

368. *grouse*. 1771 *B*.

369. *haddock*. 1708 *B* Suppl. Cf. older French, *adot, hadot*.

370. *john*. 1802 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, iv. 235.

371. *kanguroo*. 1802 *DG*.

372. *kipper* (of the salmon). 1803 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, v. 159. Cf. 1376 *Rotul. Parlamenti*, 50 Edw. iii, ii. 331. 6: 'En temps qu'il soit kiper'.

373. *lump, lompe*. 1799 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, ii. 56: 'Le lompe a deux nageoires dorsales . . .' Through the *cyclopterus lumpus* of Linnaeus, goes back to the *lumpus Anglorum* of Aldrovandi.

374. *mandrill*. *Ante* 1748 *MLR*.

375. *mastiff*. 1614 *B* (isolated instance).

376. *mudfish*. 1803 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, v. 38: 'La Caroline est la patrie du mudfish.'

377. *noddy*. 1698 *B*.

378. *opossum*. 1704 *Nouv. de la Républ. des Lettres*, Oct., p. 456: 'Lettres du docteur Édouard Tyson contenant la description anatomique des parties de l'opossum mâle qui le distinguent de la fennelle, par Guill. Cowper, membre de la société royale . . .'

379. *pécari*. 1699 *Nouv. de la Républ. des Lettres*, Apr., p. 392: 'Un jour qu'il étoit à la chasse avec le lacenta, il arriva qu'ils firent partir une espèce de pourceau sauvage, que l'auteur nomme pecary . . .' [The author is Lionel Wafer;]

the work reviewed his *New Voyage and Description of the Isthmus of America . . .*, Lond., 1699].

380. *pollack*. 1799 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, ii. 416: 'Le gade pollack'.
 381. *poney*. 1801 *DG*.
 382. *puffin*. 1760 *B*.
 383. *redcod*. 1799 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, ii. 369.
 384. *rockcod*. 1803 Lacépède, *Hist. nat. des Poiss.*, v. 673.
 385. *sprat*. 1779 *B*.
 386. *whip-poor-will*. 1779 *B*.

In Group (ii) we have:

387. *arrowroot*. 1808 *B*.
 388. *compost*. 1771 *Dict. de Trévoux*.
 389. *composter*. 1771 *Dict. de Trévoux*.
 390. *gale*. 1762 *B*. (This word comes in by way of naturalist's Latin.)
 391. *hemlock*. 1786 *B*.
 392. *hickory*. 1803 *B*.
 393. *kidney* (kind of potato). 1802 *B*.
 394. *persimon*. 1803 Volney, *Œuvres*, ed. 1821, vii. 22: 'Pruniers sauvages, pruniers-persimmons et cerisiers sauvages . . .'
 395. *ray-grass*. 1775 *B*.
 396. *spruce*. 1656 *B*.
 397. *star-apple*. 1751 Raulin, translating Sloane, *Hist. de la Jamaïque*, ii. 40.
 398. *tallipot*. 1683 *DG*.
 399. *turneps*. 1755 Duhamel du Monceau, *Traité de la culture des terres*, iv. 278: 'Les gros navets appellés *turnips*, cultivés avec soin pour servir à nourrir et à engraisser le bétail . . .'.—
 400. *yam*. 1722 Labat, *Nouv. voy. aux îles de l'Amérique*, ii. 339: 'L'yam ou igname est une espèce de betterave . . .'

Under (iii) are grouped the following:

401. *cannel-coal*. 1759 *B*.
 402. *coak, coke*. 1773 *B*.
 403. *creek*. 1759 *MLR*.
 404. *dyke*. 1759 *MLR*.
 405. *finerie*. 1774 *B*.
 406. *fire-clay*. 1780 *B*.
 407. *indium*. 1806 *B*.
 408. *osmium*. 1806 *B*.
 409. *palladium*. 1804 *B*.
 410. *potassium*. 1808 *B*.
 411. *poudingue* (as a geological term). 1753 *B*.
 412. *rhodium*. 1806 *B*.
 413. *sodium*. 1808 *B*.
 414. *subsidence*. 1803 Volney, *Œuvres*, ed. 1821, vii. 217.

415. *toadstone*. 1790 Ferber, *Essai sur l'oryctographie du Derbyshire*, 163: 'M. Faujas de St. Fond... a prouvé que certaines espèces de toadstone contenoient des filons métalliques...'

The miscellaneous words are:

416. *cow-pox*. 1799-1800 *B.*

417. *croup*. 1777 *B.*¹

418. *dispensaire*.

419. *hydromètre*. 1768 *DG.*

420. *inoculation* (of virus). 1752 *DG.*

421. *inoculer* (of virus). 1752 *DG.*

422. *lenticulaire*. 1706 *Nouv. de la Républ. des Lettres*, March, p. 309 (in a review of Newton's *Optus*).

423. *mule-jenny*. 1804 *B.*

424. *newtonianisme*. 1738 *Lettres de la Marquise du Châtelet*, ed. Asse, p. 199: 'On dit que le livre de M. Algarotti est intitulé *Le newtonianisme à la portée des dames*.'

425. *newtonien*. 1732 *B.*

426. *newtoniser*. 1736 *Lettres de la Marquise du Châtelet*, ed. Asse, p. 77: 'Et moi, je newtonise tant bien que mal.'

427. *panorama*. 1799-1800 *B.*²

428. *réflexibilité*. 1706 *MLR.*

429. *réflexible*. 1722 *DG.*

430. *réfrangibilité*. 1706 *MLR.*

431. *réfrangible*. 1706 *MLR.*

432. *réfracter*. 1752 *DG.*

433. *réfractif*. 1738 *MLR.*

434. *rickets*. 1687 *MLR.*

435. *vaccine*. 1799-1800 *DG.*³

VII

In this section I put: (i) words relating to Scotland, its life and institutions, (ii), a certain number of terms of American or Colonial origin not mentioned in any of the preceding lists.

Words of Scottish origin attested before 1815, and consequently before the cult of Walter Scott, are as follows:

¹ The adj. *croupial*, quoted from 1863 by *B.*, is already noted in 1832 by Raymond in his *Dictionnaire général*, and not as a new word.

² *Panorama*, from which are derived *panoramique* (and occasionally *panoramique*), is interesting as having served as the model on which have been made *cosmorama* (1808 Gazzera), *diorama* (1822 Daguerre and Bouton), *géorama* (1823 Delangland), *néorama* (1827 J. P. Allard), *uranorama*, *diaphanorama*.

³ The words *vacciner*, *vaccinalion*, *vaccinateur* are all three in Mercier, *Neologie* (1801), ii. 304, 305.

436. *bagpiper*. 1792 *B*.

437. *blackcock*. 1797 Faujas St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, ii. 104: 'En nous disant . . . que nous trouverions certainement des blackcocks . . .'

438. *brogue*. 1653 *B Suppl.* 1797 Faujas St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, i. 307.

439. *cairn, carn*. 1797 Faujas St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, i. 343: 'Ces monuments, auxquels ils donnent dans leur langue le nom de *carn*, qui signifie cercle druidical . . .' 1832 Raymond, *Dict. gen.*: 'carn'¹

440. *clan*. 1759 *B*.

441. *dirk*. 1797 Faujas St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, i. 307: 'Ce poignard porte le nom de *durk* ou *dirk*.'

442. *erse*. 1777 *B*.

443. *fillibeg*. 1797 Faujas St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, i. 307: 'Ils donnent à cette veste le nom de *fillibeg*'.

444. *gaélique*. 1804 *B*: 'gallique.'

445. *hébridien*. 1797 Faujas St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, ii. 78: 'Le costume hébridien.'

446. *highlandais*. 1797 Faujas St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, i. 237: 'Un assez grand nombre d'highlandois'.

447. *highlander*. 1708 *B Suppl.*

448. *kilt*. 1792 *B*.

449. *laird*. 1614 *B*.

450. *loch*. 1708 *B Suppl.*

451. *plaid*. 1708 *B*.

452. *target*. 1797 Faujas St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, i. 333: 'Ce bouclier, connu en langue du pays sous le nom de *target*, étoit solidement et proprement construit . . .'

453. *tartan*. 1797 Faujas St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, ii. 79: 'C'est l'étoffe uniforme et favorite des Highlandois; . . . elle porte le nom de *tartan*.'

(ii) Comprises:

454. *banquise*. 1797 Lescallier, *Vocab. des termes de marine*, ii. 197: 'Banquise s.f. (Fast ice). Nom que les navigateurs des mers du Nord donnent à un amas considérable de glaces, qui souvent borne l'horizon, et ferme le passage aux vaisseaux pendant longtemps.'²

455. *cabine* (= hut, log cabin). 1688 *B*.

¹ *B* gives the spelling *cairn* from 1860, cf.:

1830-1 W. Scott, *Oeuvres*, transl. by Defauconpret, ed. 1839, xviii (*Le Connétable de Chester*), 272: '(Ils)... le couvrent d'un immense cairn, c. à. d., d'un amas prodigieux de pierres.'

² *Banquise* appears to be an E. *bank-ice*; it is out of the question to derive it with the *DG* from F. *banc* and E. *ice*. *Banquise* was officially accepted by the Académie in 1835.

456. *canoe*. 1609 B.

457. *cent*.

458. *dollar*. 1778 B.

459. *log-house*. 1784 B.

460. *pickanini*. 1751 Raulin, translating Sloane, *Hist. de la Jamaïque*, ii. 177: 'Un pickanini ou enfant de nègre vaut cinq livres . . .'

461. *rapide*. 1803 Volney, *Oeuvres*, vii. 86: 'A environ cinq milles des rapides d'Ohio . . .'

462. *scalpe*. 1803 Volney, *Oeuvres*, ed. 1821, vii. 445: 'Veut-on savoir en quoi consiste le scalpe ou arrachement de la chevelure, écoutons un facteur anglais, Jean Long . . .'

463. *scalper*. 1769 B.

464. *squaw*. 1688 B

465. *swamp*. 1688. B.

466. *tatouage*. 1778 B.

467. *tatouer*. 1772 B.

468. *wigwam*. 1688 B.

469. *yaws*. 1751 Raulin, translating Sloane, *Hist. de la Jamaïque*, ii. 180: 'Les blancs . . . sont aussi tourmentés par les yaws: c'est une terrible incommodité que les Nègres de Guinée nous ont apportée . . .'

VIII

I have left to the last section a very miscellaneous list of over a hundred words. The majority have undeniably an English source. Some might have been added to lists in preceding sections. Others are of a literary character. Many are adjectives which I suspect, with more or less of certainty in each case, of having penetrated into French from English.

It is clearly to be understood, in the case of several of these words, that I merely call attention to the probability of an English source, and that the discovery of other texts or other testimony may either confirm or infirm the hypothesis. As a general rule, in advancing the theory that a French word was borrowed in the eighteenth century from English, one must be guided by the following considerations: (i) the respective dates at which the French and the corresponding English word are first attested; (ii) the nature and origin of the earliest texts in which the French word occurs; (iii) the evidence of eighteenth-century French writers.

A fair number of the words given here have not made much headway in French, but are interesting as witnesses of English influence.

470. *anti-constitutionnel*. 1787 Delolme, *Constitution de l'Angl.*, i. 83.

471. *arrière-scène*: 'back of the stage'. Noted in dictionaries of the end of the nineteenth century. Cf. 1769 Grenville, *Tabl. de l'Angl.*, 18 n.: 'La réflexion de M. Hume ne porte que sur la partie de l'objet qui prête à la plaisanterie ou au sarcasme. Il se place sur l'arrière-scène pour ne voir que des gladiateurs en relief et prudemment il baisse la toile . . .' Cf. E. *behind the scenes*.

472. *assistant* in the sense of Fr. *aide* is quoted by Féraud, *Dict. Crit.*, in 1787.

473. *ballade*: 'popular poem on legendary lore'. 1770 Contant d'Orville, *Les Nuits anglaises*, iii. 368: 'J'ai aussi le projet . . . d'entonner un air de Rosbif, ou bien quelques ballades anglaises, toutes les fois que ma femme me régalerá de ces mélodieux Italiens.'

474. *bas bleu*. 1821 *B.*

475. *begum*. 1699 *B* q v.¹

476. *bénévolence*: 'forced gift'. 1787 Delolme, *Constit. de l'Angl.*, i. 47. 1777 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, i. 313.

477. *béquête de la poule* as a translation of the E. *henpecked*. 1714-1726 *Le Spectateur, &c.*, ed. 1737, ii. 286: 'Il y a plusieurs autres sortes de bequetez de la poule qui sont, à mon avis, les meilleurs sujets de la Reine . . .'

478. *bill*, in the sense of F. *note, addition, compte*. This word is not noted by *B* but occurs commonly; cf. 1797 Faujas de St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, i. 229: 'Le bill qui nous fut présenté avoit une aune de longueur.' 1817 [Defauconpret], *Londres et ses habitants*, p. 278. 'Je demandai la note de ce que je devais, ou pour me servir du terme anglais, mon bill . . . 1823 Arcieu, *Diorama de Londres*, p. 278: 'Dublason . . . se hâta de demander son bill au pâtissier . . .', &c.

479. *bittern*. 1747 James, *Dict. de Médecine*, quoted by the *Dict. de Trévoux*, ed. 1771, i. 915: 'Dans les endroits où l'on prépare le sel tiré de l'eau de la mer, on donne le nom de bittern à la liqueur qui coule du sel commun, et qu'on reçoit dans des vaisseaux convenables; ou c'est la liqueur qui reste après la crystallisation du sel commun. Nous l'appelons eau mère.'

480. *califourchon*. In French à *califourchon* 'astride', is an adverbial

¹ For some texts quoted here and in the earlier part of this tract, I express my obligation to.

1903 F. Gohin, *Les Transformations de la Langue française de 1740 à 1789* (a valuable *Doctorat-ès-lettres* thesis of Paris University).

1909 Th. Ranft, *Wortgeschichtliches*, in *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, xxxv. 129 sq. (a useful series of texts of the revolutionary period—1789-1794—giving early instances of many French words).

expression. *Califourchon* was first used as a noun by Frenais in 1776, in his translation of Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*, as one of his renderings of *hobby-horse*. It is used only in the expression: 'C'est son califourchon.' Cf., in Bescherelle's *Dict. national*, the following quotation from Aim. Charlemagne:

Chacun a son califourchon,
A dit Steine et Sterne a raison.

Cf. *dada* below.

481. *censorial*. This word is a very doubtful Anglicism. But the earliest instance I know is in a translation from English: 1760 Lyttleton, *Dial. des Morts*, p. 105: 'Mon pouvoir censorial'.

482. *circonstanciel*. 1782 *DG*. The E. *circumstantial* is extremely common in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

483. *closet*. 1777 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, ii. 36. 'Un cabinet, nommé *closet*'.

484. *cocket*. 1761 Savary des Bruslons, *Dict. du Comm.*, iii. 472: 'koquet. On appelle ainsi en Angleterre ce qu'on nomme en France droit de sortie. Les François en payent le double de ce qu'en payent les Anglois . . .' 1845 Bescherelle, *Dict. nat.*: 'cocket, Sceau employé à la douane anglaise.'

485. *cœur brisé*. A. 1763 Abbé Prévost, *Oeuvres*, ed. 1823, xxxv. 303: 'Elle tomba dans une maladie qui n'a pas de nom dans notre langue, et qui n'est nulle part aussi funeste qu'en Angleterre.' Note on *maladie*: 'En anglais *broken-heart*. Ce mot traduit littéralement veut dire *cœur brisé*.' Littré gives an instance of *briser le cœur* from Mme de Sévigné which I have not been able to verify: 'Elle brise le cœur par l'état où elle est.' In any case, the influence of E. (*to die of*) *a broken heart, broken-hearted* is to be noted.

486. *colonisation*. (It is curious that the *OED* has not been able to quote E. *colonization* before 1770.) Cf.: 1769 Grenville, *Tabl. de l'Angl.*, p. 116: 'C'est heurter les premiers principes de la colonisation, agir diamétralement contre les intérêts de la Grande-Bretagne.' 1793 Mackintosh, *Voyages, &c.*, i. 274: 'De ce système de colonisation résulteroient les plus grands avantages pour l'Indostan, qui rejoailliroient ensuite sur la Grande-Bretagne.' 1835 ACAD.

487. *coloniser* [E. *colonize* from 1622 *OED*]. 1790 Text in *Revue des Langues romanes*, viii. 102: 'Le grand Frédéric . . . a tant colonisé et avec tant de succès'. 1793 Mackintosh, *Voyages en Europe, &c.*, i. 272: 'De l'importance de coloniser l'Amérique septentrionale et l'Indostan'. 1835 ACAD.

488. *commercial* (E. *commercial* from 1687 *OED*). 1787 Féraud, *Dict. crit.*, quotes Fr. *commercial* from the *Journal de Genève*.

489. *commodités*. 1787 Féraud, *Dict. crit.*, quotes this word in the sense of 'denrées, marchandises'.

490. *conciliatoire*. 1777 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, iii. 523: 'bills conciliatoires'. 1787 Féraud, *Dict. crit.*, quotes the above text and adds: 'Peut être bon au palais et dans les gazettes . . .' 1793 Th. Paine, *Rec. de div. écrits*, p. 56: 'Ils (les Anglois) attendent . . . le même effet de ce qu'un de leurs ministres appeloit sa motion conciliatoire . . .' 1878 ACAD.

491. *confidentiel* (E. *confidential*, 'confident' from 1651, in the French sense from 1759 *OED*). 1787 Féraud, *Dict. crit.*, quotes from Necker: 'discours confidentiels'. 1798 ACAD.

492. *confortable*. 1786 B.

493. *confortablement*. 1825 *Revue britannique*, i. 228: 'Dans la Gironde, l'ouvrier peut vivre confortablement pour 14 ou 15 sous au plus par jour . . .'

494. *congenial* (E. *congenial* from 1625 *OED*). 1806 Mme de Duras, *Letter to Rosalie de Constant*, 15 April: 'Je répète qu'il y a en nous quelque chose de congenial et que nous ne serons jamais étrangères l'une à l'autre.' See *Revue de Philol. franç., &c.*, xxvii. 94. 1860 E. D. Forques, *Originaux et Beaux Esprits de l'Angl. Contemp.*, ii. 195: 'Ces esprits de même ordre—congenials, dirait un Anglais . . .'

495. *constitutionnel*. (E. *constitutional*, in the political sense, from 1765 *OED*). 1769 Grenville, *Tableau de l'Angl.*, p. 53: 'Augmenter la force constitutionnelle . . .'; p. 131: 'La doctrine constitutionnelle'.¹

496. *constitutionnellement*. c. 1794 *DG*.

497. *continental* (E. *continental*, 'of or belonging to the continent of Europe, from 1760 *OED*; later 'of or belonging to the colonies or states of America collectively'). It is in the second sense it first appears in French: 1781 Linguet, *Annales &c.*, x. 212: 'Régiments continentaux'. 1793 Th. Paine, *Rec. de div. écrits*, p. 62: 'L'armée continentale' (i. e. the army of the United States). 1835 ACAD.

498. *convivial* (E. *convivial* from 1668 *OED*). 1714 *Le Spectateur, &c.*, ed. 1737, i. 56: 'Je ne doute pas que leur lecture ne fasse autant de plaisir que celles des lois conviviales de Ben Johnson.'

499. *convivialité*. 1816 L. Simond, *Voy. en Angl.*, i. 512: 'M.

¹ Cf. 1720 *Mém. de M. Marais*, ed. de Lescure, i. 390: 'Il n'y avoit que deux partis; il y en aura quatre . . . Le 2^e sera composé des constitutionnels zélés, qui font marcher la bulle presque de pair avec l'Evangile.' —Here *constitutionnel* means 'partisan of the Unigenitus constitution promulgated by Pope Clement XI in 1713.' It is rare, and the usual equivalent is *constitutionnaire*.

Scott n'est pas ennemi de la convivialité.' Note: 'Du mot anglais *conviviality* qui est trop près du français ainsi que du latin pour avoir besoin d'être expliqué et pour ne pas mériter d'être adopté.' 1863 Esquiros, *L'Angl. et la vie angl.* 3^e série, p. 72: 'Cet esprit de convivialité que cultivaient nos pères...' 1912 Delattre, *Robert Herrick*, p. 327: 'Deux des joies humaines les plus considérables aux yeux de Herrick: la convivialité et l'amour.'

500. *cottage*. 1754 *B.*

501. *counsellor*. 1777 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, ii. 116: 'Les counsellors ou les sergents ès lois.'

502. *critérion* (E. *criterium* from 1631 *OED*). 1750 *DG*. Not noted in the 1771 ed. of the *Dict. de Trévoux*. For the rarer form *crit're*, cf.: 1781 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, x. 432. For English preference for the Latin *-um* forms, cf. other words in this list.

503. *dada*: 'favourite project, favourite subject'. First used in 1776 by Frenais in his translation of *Tristram Shandy* as a rendering of Sterne's *hobby-horse*. 1794 Xavier de Maistre (an imitator of Sterne), *Oeuvres*, ed. 1861, p. 49: 'C'est le dada de mon oncle Tobie.' 1822 Chateaubriand, *Corresp. gén.*, ed. L. Thomas, iii. 186: 'On peut pardonner à un homme la jeunesse ou la vieillesse, mais c'est trop que deux enfances. Je ne réponds pas, à votre abbaye. C'est votre dada. Radotez à votre aise. J'ai aussi mon hobby-horse: c'est de vous aimer.' 1836 *Revue britannique*, 4^e série, i. 144: 'Ce dernier plan était son dada favori.' It is interesting to notice that the meanings of *hobby* are now in English more restricted than they were, and that the word is now used of some favourite form of activity; so that *dada* is not now its exact equivalent.

504. *déboisement*;

505. *déboiser*. These words were apparently first used by Volney in 1803 to translate E. *clearing* and E. *to clear* in speaking of the North American forests; see *Revue de Philol. franç.*, xxvi. 95-6.

506. *déourageant* (E. *discouraging* from 1678, *discouragingly* from 1690 *OED*). 1763 *DG*: 'Une pusillanimité déourageante.' Not accepted by the Academy till 1835.

507. *dérespectueux*. 1787 Féraud, *Dict. crit.*, quotes this word and declares it to be an Anglicism; he considers it no doubt as due to the influence of E. *disrespectful* on Fr. *respectueux*.

508. *désappointement*. 1785 *Journal de Paris*, Dec. 8, p. 1410: 'Après quelques désappointemens semblables, quelquefois au bout de quelques années, la solution se présentoit à moi...'

509. *désappointer*. 1761 *MLR*.

510. *dictatorial* (E. *dictatorial* from 1701 *OED*). 1790 *Mirabeau peint par lui-même*, 1791, iii. 20: 'ce pouvoir dictatorial'.

511. *druidical*. 1797 Faujas St. Fond, *Voy. en Angl.*, i. 343: 'Ces monuments, auxquels ils donnent dans leur langue le nom de *carn*, qui signifie cercle druidical . . .' Also on p. 355.

512. *dulcinée*. E. *dulcinea* (his *dulcinea*, their *dulcineas*) is not quoted by the *OED* before 1748. The F. *dulcinée* was accepted by the *Dict. de l'Acad.* in 1835. The earliest instances I have of the Fr. word occur in translations from English: 1714-26 *Le Spectateur*, &c., ed. 1737, v. 297: 'A peine y a-t-il un seul poète, bon ou mauvais, qui n'ait quelque dulcinée, feinte ou réelle.' 1786 Sterne, *Sermons in Œuvres*, ed. 1803, vi. 398: 'Combattez les monstres pour les intérêts de quelque dulcinée que vous aurez à peine vue . . .'

513. *égotisme*. 1726 *Le Spectateur ou le Socrate moderne*, ed. 1737, vi. 10: 'Le plus violent égotisme que j'aie observé dans toutes mes lectures, est celui du cardinal Wolsey, qui disoit, *Ego et rex meus . . .*'

514. *égotiste*. 1726 *Le Spectateur*, &c., ed. 1737, vi. 10: 'Peut-être que le plus grand égotiste qu'il y ait jamais eu au monde, est Michel de Montaigne, le célèbre auteur des *Essais* . . .'

515. *encourageant*. 1726 Abbé Desfontaines, *Dict. néol.*, criticizes the use of *encourageant* in La Motte's *Odes*:

Les nobles vertus que tu pares
Peut-être deviendroient plus rares
Sans ces tributs encourageants.

516. *entitrer* (à). Used in 1787 by Delolme, *Const. de l'Angl.*, ii. 60 as the equivalent of E. *to entitle* (10).

517. *excentricité* (figurative use). *Ante 1817* Mme de Staél, *Œuvres*, ed. 1821, xiv. 260: (speaking of the English). 'Il n'est point de nation où l'on trouve autant d'exemples de ce qu'on appelle *l'excentricité*, c'est-à-dire, une manière d'être tout à fait originale et qui ne compte pour rien l'opinion d'autrui'. 1836 *Revue britannique*, 4^e série, i. 367: 'La publication périodique (de Walker) intitulée *L'Original* est une des excentricités les plus piquantes de l'Angleterre moderne . . .' 1845 Barbey d'Aurevilly, *Du dandysme*, &c., p. 14: 'L'excentricité, cet autre fruit du terroir anglais . . .' 1846 Balzac, *La Cousine Bette*, ed. Flammarion, p. 33: 'La jalouse forme la base de ce caractère plein d'excentricités, mot trouvé par les Anglais pour les folies non pas des petites, mais des grandes maisons . . .', &c.

518. *excentrique* (figurative use). 1803 *Journ. gén. de la litt.*

étrangère, an xi, p. 211: 'Il aurait pu faire un meilleur usage des personnages, car dans un ouvrage de cette nature, on ne cherche que des caractères connus par leur singularité et par la vie excentrique qu'ils ont menée.' Cf. p. 563 where *Excentric philosophy* is rendered by *philosophie excentrique*. 1830-1 W. Scott, *Oeuvres*, translated by Defauconpret, xvi (*Eaux de St. Ronan*), 3: 'Un groupe de ces personnes que les journaux désignent sous le nom d'excentriques, individus qui, par un dérangement réel de l'esprit, ou beaucoup plus souvent, par un excès de vanité sont possédés de l'ambition de se distinguer par quelque singularité . . .'

519. *exertion*. 1787 Delolme, *Const. de l'Angl.*, i. 72: 'Subsides qui, pour les grandes exertions de son pouvoir, ne le soustraien point à l'influence des communes . . .' Cf. 1801 Mercier, *Néologie*, i. 244.

520. *exhibition*. 1770 *MLR*.

521. *fashion*. 1698 *B* (isolated early instance).

522. *fashionable*. 1804 *B*.

523. *forgery*. 1777 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, i. 376: 'C'est ce qu'on appelle le crime de *forgery*.' Cf. c. 1866 Esquiro, *L'Angleterre et la vie angl.*, 4^e série, p. 257: 'La répression du crime de *forgery* (contrefaçon des billets de banque) donna lieu, il y a une quarantaine d'années, à une vive controverse en Angleterre.'

524. *franc-pensant*, *franc-penseur*. See *MLR*.

525. *garret*. 1777 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, ii. 36: 'Chambres de domestiques sous le nom de *garrets* . . .'

526. *hobbisme*. 1771 *Dict. de Trévoux*.

527. *humour*. 1693 *MLR*: 'humeur.'

528. *husband-woman* 1783 Baculard d'Arnaud, *Délassements de l'homme sensible*, ii. 311 n.: 'Les Anglois ont une expression qui réunit les diverses qualités qu'on exige d'une femme estimable, *husband-woman*. Il est fâcheux que notre langage ne puisse rendre l'idée attachée à cette expression. La langue angloise en a beaucoup de ce genre, et en cela elle approche plus que la nôtre de la Grecque, si féconde en termes pittoresques qui expriment une image par un seul mot.'

529. *immoral* (E. *immoral* from 1660 *OED*). 1776 *DG*. The Italian dictionaries say that an Italian *immorale* was used in the eighteenth century by Anton Maria Salvini (1653-1729); it is worth while quoting the passage which is in the Annotations on *La Fiera* of Michael Angelo and is given in Gherardini, *Supplimento a vocabolari italiani*, iii. 422: 'Hanno gran forza quelle loro voci (degli Inglesi) *immorale*, cioè uomo che non ha morale, *imparziale*, che non prende parte, ne parzialità.'

530. *immoralité* (E. *immorality* from 1566 *OED*). 1789 Two examples quoted by Th. Ranft in *Zeitschr. f. franz. Spr. u. Lit.*, xxxv, 137.

531. *impartial* 1732 *DG*; *impartialement* 1740 *DG*; *impartialité* 1725 *DG*. It is likely that these words are due in part to English influence at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century; cf. Salvini's statement under *immoral*. But the words had probably been in use in the sixteenth century though they are not in the greater French dictionaries; cf. 1618 Mellema, *Den Schat der Duytscher Tale*, ed. 1630: 'onpartijdich, impartial, qui ne soutient ne l'une ne l'autre partie; onpartijdicheyt, impartialité.'

532. *impeachment*. 1781 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, xi. 365: 'Un impeachmen de la chambre des communes . . .'

533. *impopulaire*. 1789 Mirabeau peint par lui-même, 1791, ii. 45: 'Plusieurs députés impopulaires ayant été menacés . . .'

534. *impopularité*. 1789 Mirabeau, *Commerce des États-Américains* (a translation from English), p. 42: 'L'impopularité de nos lois'.

535. *inactif* (E. *inactive* from 1725 *OED*). ante 1771 *DG*.

536. *inactivité* (E. *inactivity* from 1646 *OED*). 1726 *Le Spectateur, &c.*, ed. 1737, vi. 151: 'Quoique l'inactivité du corps ait donné lieu à appeler le sommeil l'image de la mort . . .' The *OED* quotes E. *inactivity* from a letter of Pope to Gay of the 21st of July 1723; in the French translation of this letter (Pope, *Oeuvres*, ed. 1754, v. 182) E. *inactivity* is rendered by F. *inaction*.

537. *incidentel* (E. *incidental* from 1644 *OED*). 1781 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, xi. 293: 'Phrases incidentelles.' Beaumarchais uses *incidentellement*.

538. *inconditionnel* (E. *unconditional* from 1646 *OED* now obsolete; *unconditional*) 1783 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, xiv. 59: 'L'indépendance inconditionnelle cédée aux Américains.'

539. *inconsistance* (E. *inconsistency* from 1651 *OED*; E. *inconsistency* from 1699 *OED*). 1755¹ Rouquet, *État des arts en Angleterre*, p. 108: 'Tout ornement introduit dans un portrait aux dépens de l'effet de la tête est une inconsistance'. The word was not accepted by the Academy till 1878.

540. *inconsistant* (E. *inconsistent* from 1646 *OED* and very common). 1793 Beaumarchais, *Oeuvres*, ed. 1809, ii. 327: 'A l'âge inconsistant où les fautes se sont commises'. 1878 ACAD.¹

541. *inconstitutionnel*. 1778 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, iii. 500: 'De-

¹ Cf. c. 1843 Balzac, *Illusions perdues*: 'Vous avez été ce que les Anglais appellent *inconsistant*, reprit le chanoine en souriant.'

mande illégale et, suivant l'idiome breton, inconstitutionnelle . . . ' Here *breton* = British.

542. *inconstitutionnellement*. 1783 Linguet, *Annales, &c.* xv. 22. .

543. *indélicat* (E. *indelicate* from 1742 *OED*). 1786 Louvet de Couvray, *Faublas*, iii. 36: 'indélicate exclamation'. *Indélicat* was accepted by the Academy in 1835 with *indélicatesse*. *Indélicatement* was not inserted till 1878 into the *Dict. de l'Acad.*; it is first noted by Raymond, *Dict. gén.* (1832) who declares it new.

544. *indéniable* (E. *undeniable* quite common from the seventeenth century). 1832 Raymond, *Dict. gén.*, quotes it from Boiste and adds: *inusité*. 1878 ACAD.

545. *indésirable*. B quotes Fr. *indésirable* from 1905 as a reflex of the E. *undesirable* as in *undesirable alien*. Cf. 1801 Mercier, *Néologie*, ii. 34: 'Platon, tout Platon qu'il était, désira jouir des plaisirs de la cour du roi de Syracuse; il en jouit, et vit combien, pour un philosophe, ils étaient indésirables. Les Latins disent *inoptabilis*; les Italiens *innappetabile*; les Anglais *undesirable*'.

546. *indictment*. 1783 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, xv. 308: 'On prononce l'indictment ou poursuite ultérieure.' 1787 Delolme, *Constit. de l'Angl.*, i. 172.

547. *inintelligent* (E. *unintelligent* from the middle of the eighteenth century). 1784 Restif de la Bretonne, *Le paysan et la paysanne pervertis*, ii. 451: 'Echos inanimés, inintelligents de Jean Jacques. 1878 ACAD'.

548. *ininterrompu*. 1776 Chambaud and Robinet, *New Dict.*, ii. 565: 'An uninterrupted rest, un repos ininterrompu.' 1878 ACAD.

549. *injustifiable* (E. *unjustifiable* common from the seventeenth century). 1795 Snetlage, *Nouv. dict.*: 'Un aveuglement injustifiable'. 1878 ACAD.

550. *inoffensif* (E. *inoffensive* common from the seventeenth century). 1801 Mercier, *Néologie*, ii. 53 sq., quotes the word from a French translation of Sterne and from Louvet de Couvray. 1835 ACAD.

551. *inquisitional* (E. *inquisitional* from 1644 *OED*). 1787 Delolme, *Constit. de l'Angl.*, i. 42: 'Tribunal inquisitional'.

552. *insane*. 1815 Pillet, *L'Angl. vue à Londres*, p. 202: 'John Gibbon de Harwich a assassiné sa femme . . . Gibbon a été jugé *insane* et acquitté . . . '

553. *insanité* (E. *insanity* from 1590 *OED*). 1815 Pillet, *L'Angl. vue à Londres*, p. 201: 'Le 21 août 1813 Charles Connel a été renvoyé sous le bill d'*insanité*; il était accusé d'avoir tenté plusieurs fois d'*assassiner* sa femme . . .' 1832 Raymond, *Dict. gén.*, i. 760: 'Insanité s. f. manque de

bon sens, aliénation de jugement, folies, extravagance. *Peu usité*? 1798 ACAD.

554. *insignifiance* (E. *insignificance* from 1699 *OED*, E. *insignificance* from 1651 *OED*). 1786 Toussaint, *Journ. de la langue françoise*, iii. 306. 1798 ACAD.

555. *insignifiant* (E. *insignificant* from 1651 *OED*). 1780 Saussure, *Voyages dans les Alpes*, iv. 220: 'Fentes insignifiantes'. 1798 ACAD. Tournon, *Les promenades de Clarisse*, p. 233, proposes the word *insignifiant*, which has not made its way: cf. E. *insignificant* in the *OED*.

556. *instinctif* (E. *instinctive* from the seventeenth century). 1803 *DG*. 1835 ACAD. Cf. *MLR*.

557. *judicel* (E. *judicial*). 1787 Delolme, *Constit. de l'Angl.* i. 65: 'Pouvoir judicel'.

558. *lauréat* in *poète lauréat* (cf. Weekley, *Etym. Dict.*, 828 who quotes Chaucer: 'Fraunceys Petrak, the lauriat poete'). 1745 Abbé le Blanc, *Lettres d'un françois*, iii. 156: 'M. Cibber notre poète lauréat. . .' 1762 ACAD.

559. *libre-pensée*. See *MLR*.

560. *libre-penseur*. See *MLR*.

561. *licenseur*. 1787 Delolme, *Constit. de l'Angl.*, ii. 40: 'Un licenseur sans l'approbation duquel rien ne pouvait être mis au jour. . .'

562. *lilliputien*. 1727 *B*.

563. *lockien*, *lockiste*. 1801 Mercier, *Néologie*, ii. 100.

564. *longévité* (E. *longevity* from 1615 *OED*). 1787 Féraud, *Dict. crit.*, quotes *longévité* from various authors and the *Journal de Genève*.

565. *lovelace*. 1766 *B* Suppl.

566. *lune de miel* (E. *honeymoon* from 1546 *OED*). 1747 *MLR*. Cf. *mois sucré*.

567. *magasin*, *magazine*. 1750 *B*: 'magasin'; 1776 *B*: 'magazine'. Cf. 1741 *Le magasin des événements de tous genres... recueillis par une société d'amis*, Amsterdam, 4 vols. in 8vo, 1741 and 1742.

568. *maximum* (E. *maximum* from 1740 *OED*). 1762 ACAD.

569. *medium* occurs fairly commonly in translations of English books. Cf. an example of 1765 in *MLR*. (E. *medium* from 1584 *OED* in various senses.)

570. *mésinterprétation*, used by Diderot, *MLR*.

571. *mésinterpréter*. 1769-70 J. J. Rousseau, *Confessions*, ix: 'Ne craignez-vous point qu'on ne mésinterprète votre conduite?'

572. *minimum* (E. *minimum* from 1663 *OED*). 1762 ACAD.

573. *moderniser* (E. *modernize* in 1748, 1752, 1753 &c., *OED*). 1754 Pope, *Oeuvres*, iii. 191: 'A donner un air de nouveauté aux ouvrages des anciens, A les adapter au goût du siècle, et s'il m'est permis de hazarder le terme, à

les moderniser... 1796 *Le Néologiste français*, s. v. *département*: 'Département. Vieux mot aristocratique, mais rajeuni, modernisé et démocratisé...' 1878 ACAD.

574. *moraliste* (E. *moralist* from 1621 *OED*). 1727 *Le Freeholder*, p. 215: 'Ce petit animal, dit cet excellent moraliste...' (The English text says: 'This little animal, says the old moralist...') 1762 ACAD.

575. *muséum* (E. *museum* 'repository' from 1615 *OED*; cf. in 1683: 'Mr. Ashmole's museum'). 1765 *DG*.

576. *non-sens* (E. *nonsense* from 1614 *OED*; extremely common). In addition to the texts I have quoted in the *MLR*, cf. 1714-26 *Le Spectateur*, &c., ed. 1737, iii. 241: 'Le réservoir d'une substance molle et spongieuse, que les anatomistes françois appellent *gahmatias*, et les nôtres *nonsense*.' 1782 Baculard d'Arnaud, *Délassements de l'homme sensible*, i. 3: 'D'où vient ce *non-sense*; ce défaut de sens répandu si universellement, surtout parmi nos premiers fabricateurs de chroniques?'

577. *non-succès* (E. *non-success* from 1665 *OED*). Various attempts are made to express the same idea in French at the end of the eighteenth century: (1) *insuccès*. 1801 Mercier, *Néologie*, ii. 60; (2) *irréussite*. 1801 Mercier, *Néologie*, ii. 71; (3) *non-réussite*. 1792 *La Société des Jacobins*, Documents publ. by F. Aulard, iv. 57; and (4) *non-succès*. 1782 Mercier, *Tableau de Paris*, iv. 111; cf. 1803 Volney, *Œuvres*, ed. 1821, vii. 312: 'Le caractère contagieux presque pestilental (de la fièvre jaune) . . . excuse très heureusement le non-succès de ceux qui ne guérissent pas souvent.'

578. *nursery*. *Ante* 1763 Abbé Piévest, *Œuvres*, ed. 1823, xxviii. (Grandisson) 424: 'Je l'amènerai dans notre nourricerie, pour compléter le chorus, quand nos marmots seront en train de crier . . .'

579. *oppressif*. The fifteenth-century Fr. *oppressif* (see *DG*) died out. The word is found again at the end of the eighteenth century, in special reference to government and taxation. This resurrection is due to the E. *oppressive*, cf. *ante* 1763 Piévest, *Hist. d'Angl.*, quoted by Fériaud, *Dict. crit.*, who approves of the new word; 1769 Grenville, *Tabl. de l'Angl.*, p. 137: 'Ce fardeau oppressif, mis sur le peuple anglois, ne l'accablera plus si longtemps, s'il est enfin partagé.' 1774 Condorcet in *Corresp. inéd. de Condorcet et de Turgot*, ed. Henry, p. 201: 'Plus la jurisprudence criminelle est cruelle, sécrète, oppressive, plus les parlements sont puissants.' 1787 Delolme, *Constit. de l'Angl.*, i. 8: 'Gouvernement oppressif'. 1835 ACAD.

580. *pamphlet*. 1653 B. The E. *pamphleteer* is rendered by

pamphletier (Voltaire), *pamphleteur*, and lastly *pamphletaire*.

581. *pandémonium*. 1714-26 *Le Spectateur*, &c., ed. 1737, iv. 283: 'Que peut-on se représenter de plus beau que le *pandæmonium*, le paradis, le ciel, les anges, Adam et Eve?'

582. *papier*: 'newspaper'. 1731 *MLR*.

583. *patient* (= 'malade'). 1787 Féraud, *Dict. crit.*, finds it in translations from English works. Cf. 1860 *Le Bon Ton*, xxv. i. 296: 'Parmi les plus charmantes patientes (le mot est à la mode) venues à Paris pour y recouvrer la santé, on cite surtout la fille d'un noble lord...'

584. *patriote*. In the modern sense not found in Richelet from 1680 to 1732; it appears in the *Dict. de l'Acad.* in 1762 and in the *Dict. de Trévoux* in 1771. 1729 Boyer, *The Royal Dictionary*: 'patriote s. m. Bon patriote (ce mot a vieilli: il signifioit un homme zélé pour sa patrie), a patriot, a publick spirited man.'

585. *patriotique* (E. *patriotical*, 1691 *OED*). 1758 *MLR*.

586. *patriotiquement*. 1790 *La Société des Jacobins*, Documents publ. by F. Aulard, i. 189. 1798 *ACAD*.

587. *patriotisme*. (E. *patriotism* 1726 *OED*). 1750 *MLR*. 1762 *ACAD*.

588. *pinchbeck* (from Christopher Pinchbeck, a Fleet Street watchmaker, inventor of the alloy; he died in 1732). 1761 Savary des Bruslons, *Dict. du Comm.*, iii. 197: 'pinchbek ou similor'. The word is possibly to be found in the 1753 translation by d'Holbach of Wallerius' *Mineralogia* (1747) to which Savary refers.

589. *pit*. 1777 Linguet, *Annals*, &c., i. 208: 'Le pit ou parterre...'

590. *plantation* (of Ireland and in the colonies). 1704 Clarendon, ii. 60: 'On envoya seulement quelques troupes dans l'Ultonie pour y défendre leurs plantations...' 1751 Lediard, *Hist. nat. d'Angl.*, iii. 594.

591. *planteur* (of a colony). 1751 Raulin, translating Sloane, *Hist. de la Jamaïque*, ii. 132.

592. *populaire* (in sense 3 of *DG*, 'having the people's favour') 1687 Miège.

593. *popularité*. 1725 Le P. Catrou, *Hist. rom.*, quoted by Desfontaines, *Dict. néol.*, ed. 1728, p. 134: 'Fabius, inspiré par sa popularité, songea à réconcilier le peuple avec le sénat.'

594. *population*. 1750 *DG*.

595. *post-scriptum*. Cf. 1541 *Corresp. polii. de G. Pellicier*, ed. Tausserat-Radel, i. 402: 'Par un post scripta en chiffre du iii^e. du dict mois.' The form in *-um* may be due to English; cf. 1704 *Nouv. de la Républ. des Lettres*, May, p. 593: 'A short view of Mr. Whiston's Chronology, &c.,

c. à. d. Courte revue de la chronologie du Vieux Testament de Mr. Whiston . . . avec un postscriptum, sur la règle que nous suivons dans l'observation de la Pâque, servant de réponse aux non-conformistes.' 1709 Clarendon, v. 3: 'Et le lord Germain dans un *post scriptum* au bas de la lettre qu'il écrivit au Chancelier de l'échiquier l'avertissoit . . .' 1762 ACAD.

596. *precinct*. 1787 Delolme, *Constit. de l'Angl.*, ii. 61: 'Un connétable, hors de son precinct ou ressort . . .'

597. *prohibitoire*. 1787 Féraud, *Dict. crit.*, quotes it from Linguet and declares it to be an anglicism.

598. *providentiel* (E. *providential* from 1648 *OED*; *providentially* 1614 *OED*). 1801 Mercier, *Néologie*, ii. 197 quotes from Cerutti: 'Anglais, souvenez-vous des miracles que la liberté opéra chez vous dès son berceau ! souvenez-vous de la leçon exemplaire que l'indépendance de l'Amérique vous a donnée ! Cet enchaînement secret de causes obscures qui élèvent et renversent les états, semble dirigé par une main providentielle et vengeresse des forfaits.' 1878 ACAD.

599. *recteur*. 1783 Baculard d'Arnaud, *Délassements de l'homme sensible*, iii. 30: 'Norston se hâte de se rendre chez le recteur.' Note: 'Le recteur. C'est le nom qu'on donne aux ministres qui remplissent chez nos voisins les fonctions de nos curés.'

600. *report*. 1787 Delolme, *Constit. de l'Angl.*, i. 101: 'Les extraits des jugements sont donnés au public sous le nom de *reports*.'

601. *républicanisme* (E. *republicanism* from 1689 *OED*). 1750 *D.G.* 1835 ACAD. A form *républicisme* is found in the period of the first French revolution.

602. *restrainte*. 1787 Delolme, *Constit. de l'Angl.*, ii. 247 n.: 'Sa passation (du bill) aurait libéré la chambre haute de toute restrainte quelconque quant au gouvernement . . .'

603. *revue* (periodical publication). 1708 *B*: 'Review'.

604. *robinson*. 1721 *B*.

605. *romantique* (E. *romantic* from 1628 *OED*).

606. *sensorium*. 1726 *Le Spectateur*, &c., ed. 1737, vi. 30: 'On ne sauroit se former une idée plus noble et plus sublime de cet espace infini que celle du chevalier Newton qui l'appelle le *sensorium* de la Divinité. Les hommes et les autres animaux ont leur *sensoriola* ou leurs petits *sensoriums* . . .' 1738 Voltaire, *Elém. de la philos. de Newton*, in *Oeuvres*, ed. 1785, xxxi. 34. 1762 ACAD.

607. *sentimental*. 1769 Frenais, translating Sterne, *Voyage Sentimental, avertissement*, p. 5: 'Le mot anglois *sentimental* n'a pu se rendre en françois par aucune expression qui pût y

répondre, et on l'a laissé subsister.' For its derivatives, see *B.*

608. *shebeen*. 1782 Baculard d'Arnaud, *Délassements de l'homme sensible*, i. 344: 'Un baril d'une espèce de bière très mauvaise qu'ils appellent dans leur langue *schebeen* . . .'

609. *social*. 1731-40 *MLR*.

610. *spleen*. 1745 *MLR*.

611. *splenétique*. 1776 *B.* The influence of *spleen* is seen in forms like *spleenique* and even *splenétique*: cf.: 1879 E. de Goncourt, Preface to E. Bergerat's *Théophile Gautier*, p. iv: 'Une voix dont la musique voilée et la tristesse sereine avaient comme l'accent d'un spleenétique de l'Orient.'

612. *statu quo*. 1764 M. A. Bouchaud, translating Mis. Brooke, *Hist. de Julie Mandeville*, ii. 16: 'Son 1^{er}venu restera in *statu quo* . . .' 1791 *Moniteur*, reprint 1847-63, x. 521 A: 'Je demande que vous ordonniez le *statu quo*, c'est-à-dire que vous suspendiez l'exécution du décret.' 1835 ACAD.

613. *subversif* (E. *subversive* from 1644 *OED*). 1791 *La Société des Jacobins*, Documents publ. by F. Aulard, ii. 226: 'J'ajoute la motion que le système de l'inviolabilité absolue du roi soit regardé comme subversif de la constitution.' 1835 ACAD.

614. *untonné*. 1777 Linguet, *Annales, &c.*, ii. 51: 'Soupe untonnée'.

615. *usquebaugh*, *usquebac*. 1782 Baculard d'Arnaud, *Délassements de l'homme sensible*, i. 344: 'Une eau-de-vie de grain nommée dans le même jargon, *usque-baugh*, qui apprécie pour le goût et la qualité de l'eau de genièvre la plus commune.'

616. *vers blanc*. 1714 *Le Spectateur, &c.*, ed. 1737, i. 199 n.: 'On sait bien que la rime de la plupart de ces vers n'est pas exacte; mais on a cru qu'il valoit mieux en aprocher, pour s'accommoder aux oreilles françoises, que de ne point rimer du tout, à la manière de ce que les Anglois appellent *blank verse*, tels que sont ici ceux de l'original.' 1771. *Dict. de Trévoux*: 'vers blancs. On nomme ainsi des vers composés d'un nombre déterminé de syllabes, mais sans rime et sans stances. Quelques poètes anglois les ont mis à la mode . . .'

617. *vulgarisme*. 1801 Mercier, *Néologie*, ii. 326: 'Vulgarisme. Façon de parler basse, comme barbarisme, &c. Ce mot emprunté de l'anglais, figurerait souvent dans le compte que nos journaux rendent des mille et un romans du jour (Piis).'

618. *vulgarité*. See *MLR*.

619. *whiski*, *wiski* (kind of carriage). 1782 J. Delille, *Oeuvres*, ed. 1817, i. 209. 1782 Mercier, *Tableau de Paris*, ix. 266: 'Wiski. Hautes voitures imitées des Anglois.'

620. *yahoo, yahou.* 1760 J. des Champs, translating Lyttleton, *Dialogues des Morts*, p. 30: 'Le philosophe superbe que toute la vertu dont il est si fier n'élève gueres au-dessus du yahoo'. Cf. 1872 Taine, *Notes sur l'Angleterre*, p. 38: 'Figures abruties, inquiétantes de yahous femelles.' I have not the 1727 French translation of Gulliver's travels; the word occurs no doubt there for the first time.

621. *yankee.* 1776 B.

622. *yeoman.* 1614 B.

623. *yeomanry.* 1799 Mallet du Pan, *Mercure britannique*, ii. 313: 'L'établissement militaire . . . En yeomanry: 52,274 hommes'.

The list I have given under Section VIII is in no sense intended to be exhaustive. It is rather intended to be suggestive, and to indicate something of the method to be followed in any attempt to fix the part English has played in the creation of French neologism from 1685. I am personally convinced that the part is much greater than is usually believed. The difficulty of arriving at a complete elucidation of the question is in part due to the fact that French lexicography is behind the times; and that we particularly need a historical dictionary of that language built up on the monumental plan adopted for the *Oxford English Dictionary*. What is wanted is information from dated texts. I hope that this little monograph may contribute something to the need.

CORRESPONDENCE

DIALECTAL WORDS

A CORRESPONDENT who commends our advocacy of dialectal words urges that the prejudices against their admission into 'cultured' speech would be much weakened, if it were more generally known how very many words which we now respect and value were condemned as vulgar by the would-be guardians of polite literature but a few generations ago; and he offers the following examples:

'Ralph Thoresby' (he writes), 'an antiquarian of Leeds, who about 200 years ago made a collection of local terms, instances and explains the words *bleak*, *luncheon*, *muffin*, *paddock*, *saunter*, and *swamp*; which are now familiar.

'Sir Thomas Browne speaks of *stingy* as an East-Anglian term, and Edward Fitzgerald gives *week-end* from the same region.

'*Cantankerous* is first found in Wiltshire in the eighteenth century; and other words similarly descriptive of character, such as *rollicking*, *pernickety*, *niggling*, *shabby*, have no higher authority; and so perhaps *flabbergast* and *dawdle*.

'Again *nugget*, and *coke*, and the useful compounds *bed-rock* and *output*, are miners' words from the North: and it is from Northern dialects that we get the railway terms *shunt*, *bogey*, *trolley*, *tram*.

'*Blight* seems to be a term of local origin, and dialect has some claim to *clover*, as we pronounce it.

'If a complete collection of these dialectal words could be made, it would show them to be not only very numerous, but very rich; words like *fad*, *nag*, *sham*, *pet*, *hub*, *skid*, and *thud* have made themselves indispensable, and at least four words of this class, *tram*, *coke*, *lunch*, and *snob* have been borrowed into most European languages.'

CHARABANKS OR CHARS-A-BANCS

WE are asked whether Charabanc is an English word, and what its plural is.

It is commonly written in English with hyphens and accent, and thus the *O. E. D.* took it in 1889 from the Press, *char-à-banc*; and the plural *chars-à-bancs* is sometimes seen, e.g. in the *Daily Telegraph*.

But the French term in the singular is *char à bancs*, unhyphenated, wherefore our English *char-à-banc* is neither French nor English.

Again the *Daily Telegraph*'s plural *chars-à-bancs* is a perverse pedantry, because it implies the sounding of the *s* of *chars* (shahzabanx) which is not sounded in French; the French singular is pronounced as *charaban*, and the plural as *charabans*. At least Littré is precise on this point. 'Dans *char à bancs* l's ni le *c* ne se lient jamais: un *char-à-ban élégant* [what an epithet!]: au pluriel l's ne se lie pas: des *chars à bancs*, dites: des *char-a-ban*'.

Our English singular is certainly *charabanc* or *charabang*, but not *charabanks*: we pronounce it, I believe, *sharrabang*:—it is perhaps a pity that we do not so spell it—and the plural of this word is made in the usual way by adding an *s*, *sharrabangs*. What pronunciation the consensus of its passengers will eventually determine one cannot foretell, but the principles of our Society would meanwhile urge the provisional spelling of *charabanc*, *charabancs* without hyphens or accent.

[ED.]

S. P. E.

TRACT N^{o.} VIII

WHAT IS PURE FRENCH

By

Matthew Barnes

NOTE ON “AS TO”

By

H. W. Fowler

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS



At the Clarendon Press

M DCCCC XXII

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Amen Corner *London EC 4*
29-35 West 32nd Street *New York*
Cathedral Buildings *Melbourne*
100 Princes Street *Edinburgh*
104 West George Street *Glasgow*
25-27 Richmond Street West *Toronto*
17-19 Elphinstone Circle *Bombay*
10 Esplanade George Town *Madras*
Temple Chambers, Old Post Office Street *Calcutta*
Markham's Buildings, Adderley Street *Cape Town*
C 445 Honan Road *Shanghai*

HUMPHREY MILFORD *Publisher to the University*

WHAT IS PURE FRENCH?

ESTHÉTIQUE DE LA LANGUE FRANÇAISE

THIS is the title of a book by the late M. Remy de Gourmont,¹ published in 1905. We propose to give a summary of its earlier chapters, in the hope that a comparison of the author's account of the present condition of French may help our readers to see more clearly what the objects of the S. P. E. are: for while some seem to think that any interference with speech must be pedantic, others question the possibility of any action being effective.

Remy de Gourmont's opinions are extreme, and we do not always indorse what we have thought worth quoting. Our object is to show how very similar the conditions of modern French and our own English are, and to infect our readers with a little of his enthusiasm. The cause which he advocates is identical with that of our Society; and when it is stated in terms of a foreign language its details may be judged without the prejudices which corresponding proposals arouse in our own.

Words are of three kinds or classes:

- I. *de formation populaire*, made by the people;
- II. „ „ *savante*, introduced by the learned;
- III. *mots étrangers*, imported from other tongues.

As examples of these three classes he gives as types:

- I. *maison*;
- II. *habitation*;
- III. *home*.

The first class forms the essential nucleus and mass of the language, the source of its beauty and character, and it should determine the forms of the words in the other two classes. All words in class I have been thoroughly developed and moulded to the spirit of the language by long popular use; but in classes II and III the words (with

¹ A book by the same author, *Le latin mystique*, which had a wide sale, has, at least in this country, so damaged his reputation for scholarship that his opinions must be taken entirely on their own merits.

accidental exceptions) have not been so well, if at all, assimilated ; and since they escape from being rubbed down by popular instinct, they need conscious attention ; and that can only be supplied by those who have scientific knowledge of the situation and such aesthetic sympathy as enables them to judge rightly.

The great number of unassimilated words raises the question whether the old power of assimilation be not lost : 'Leur nombre croissant pourrait faire craindre que le français fût en train de perdre son pouvoir d'assimilation, jadis si fort, si impérieux ; il n'en est rien, mais la demi-instruction, si malheureusement répandue, oppose à cette vieille force l'inertie de plusieurs sophismes' (p. 15).

It follows that he will deal only with classes II and III.

France being a Romance language, and originally derived from the Latin, he has to distinguish the veritable old inheritance of class I from the later imperfectly assimilated Latin ; and as an example of these later Latin words he gives all words with the *-tion* or *-sion* suffix, saying that there are some 2,000 of them, of which only some 20 could appear on a page of good prose (!), asserting that the old suffix of these words was *-aison*. The *-tion* class, he says, sometimes made doublets, as *émotion* of *émoi*, or sometimes drove out an old French word, as *construction* supplanted *afaiture*.

[The selection of *émoi* as an illustration is rather unfortunate, for *émoi* has no etymological connexion with *émouvoir* : it is akin to the English *dismay*. The modern sense of the substantive, however, is influenced by the popular fancy that it is related to the verb. Now if the author had known the real facts, they would have suited his purpose admirably. For the association of *émoi* with *émouvoir*, though historically false, is part of the natural development of the French tongue, and should be respected as such. The instinct which prompted this 'popular etymology' was an eminently healthy one. For the language really needed a verbal noun recognizably belonging to *émouvoir* (the foreign *émotion* is not recognizably connected with the verb for the Frenchman who knows no Latin) ; if the need has been supplied by altering the meaning of an existing French word of popular formation, the gain to the language is just as real as if it had been obtained by means more satisfactory to pedants.

The moral of this is that we should resist the pedantic tendency to banish indiscriminately from our language all formations resulting from popular etymology. To be sure, not all popular etymologies have merit. I do not regret the disappearance of 'sparrowgrass'. But if it had so happened that the asparagus was notoriously the favourite food of sparrows the thoroughly anglicized form would have been well worthy of preservation, and 'asparagus' might fitly have been left to the botanists.

The wholesale condemnation of the words in *-tion* is surely extravagant. But the author has a sound notion of what constitutes 'purity' in a language. Learned formations and adopted foreign words are no offence against purity, provided that they blend harmoniously with the native vocabulary, and do not depend for their effectiveness on the hearer's knowledge of a foreign tongue. However it may be with French, in English the suffix *-ation* has become so thoroughly naturalized that the words formed with it are, as a class, certainly not felt as un-English.]

Even when a doublet supplies a new meaning he questions its right to exist, maintaining that a word can carry as many as fifteen meanings without confusion; and that it is better to be economical in terms and rely on context for differentiation than to have a vocabulary so large that the greater part of it escapes popular handling, and the whole is not really known or used by any one person.

'L'abondance des termes distincts est une pauvreté, par la difficulté que tant de sonorités étrangères trouvent à se loger dans une mémoire, et aussi parce que chacun de ces mots, réduit à une signification unique, est en lui-même bien pauvre et bien fragile. On arrive à ne coordonner qu'un assemblage énorme et disparate de vases de terre presque entièrement vides' (p. 33).

[An ingenious paradox, which has some truth in it, but is on the whole false. It may be consolatory to a Frenchman to be told that it is a sign of riches, not of poverty, in his native tongue that it does not distinguish between 'loving' and 'liking', or that it has only the one word *crier* for half a dozen meanings that are differentiated in English. But probably few Englishmen will agree. And it is not a fault in a language to

have subtleties of expression that require care and cultivated taste for their correct use. But it is no doubt true that sometimes sense-distinctions, not called for by any needs of expression, have been forced upon languages by pedantic grammarians and lexicographers, unduly preoccupied with etymology or logic. When a native speaker of a language can be 'correct' only by remembering with an effort some rule that he has learnt, it is a sign that the language has suffered damage from the meddling of grammarians.]

In this class II he makes a special sub-class of abstract words introduced by philosophers who, writing in French, still thought in terms of Latin scholasticism: words like *actualité, priorité, identité*. And he says that this invasion discredited native speech by making it seem a relic of barbarism in the presence of intelligent thought.

On the other hand he recognizes the affinity between these new Latin words and the older French, and the propriety of Latin above all languages to supply new terms: Latin is nearest of kin. But it is pedantry to require that the new words should keep their original meanings: and since it is often a new object or idea that calls for them, it would be absurd.

[The doctrine expressed in the last sentence is thoroughly sound. Compare the following: 'It was well that in the sixteenth century English should "borrow" (as we aptly say) largely from Latin; but it was not until the loans were converted into gifts—that is to say, until the genius of the language became free to treat the adopted words as its own, to extend or limit their meanings in accordance with its own needs, emancipated from the dead hand of etymology—that they constituted a real accession of wealth.' (H. B. in *Shakespeare's England*, ii. 965.)] (ED.)

He then deals with Greek words, and thinks that the facility in making Greek compounds may have led to neglecting the native French power of combining words. He would wish to restore old French names and terms in medicine and anatomy.

The French situation here is so like our own that we shall not follow him into detail: but note that, while he

duly values many beautiful scientific words which come from the Greek and Latin, he agrees with Nodier (1828): 'La langue des sciences est devenue une espèce d'argot moitié grec, moitié latin' (p. 54).

In Chapter IV he condemns the terminology of the decimal system: and praises the French terms in hunting, heraldry, and masonry, taking the last for illustration.

'Que l'on parcoure donc "Le Dictionnaire du constructeur, ou vocabulaire des maçons, charpentiers, serruriers, etc.", et l'on verra que tous les outils, tous les travaux de tous ces ouvriers ont trouvé dans la langue française des syllabes capables de les désigner clairement. La lente organisation d'une telle langue fut un travail admirable auquel tous les siècles ont collaboré. Elle est faite d'images, de mots détournés d'un sens primitif et choisis pour un motif qu'il est souvent difficile d'expliquer. Voici quelques-uns de ces termes dont plusieurs sont familiers à tous sous leur double signification: *marron, talon, barbe, jet-d'œau, valet, chevron, poutre, dos-d'âne, poitrail, corbeau, œil-de-bœuf, gueule-de-loup, tête-de-mort, queue-de-carpe*, et tous noms d'engins destinés à soulever des faîdeaux: *bâlier, mouton, moufle, grue, chèvre, vérin . . .*' (p. 63).

Chapter V is headed, 'Les mots grecs-français jugés d'après leur forme et leur sonorité'. He is able to praise a good many Greek terms. 'La chimie et la médecine ont créé les mots dont *glucose, amauréuse* sont des types assez bons et qui démontrent qu'avec un peu de goût la formation savante serait maniable sans danger pour la langue' (p. 66), and again, 'Asthme figure dans la langue depuis plusieurs siècles, ainsi que la *phthisie* (ou *phtisie*, avec une incorrection), mais l'usage les avait très heureusement déformés en *asme* et en *tésie*: c'est d'ailleurs pour nos organes une nécessité que cet adoucissement. Les almanachs de l'école de Salerne avaient encore popularisé *apoplexie, paralysie, épilepsie, anthrax*, mais la langue ne les avait admis qu'avec des modifications considérables: *popelisie, palacine, épilencie, antras*, mots excellents et très aptes à signifier clairement les maladies qu'ils représentent' (p. 66). This chapter concludes with rules for assimilating Greek syllables, of which the principles are thus stated: 'Le premier remède sera de rejeter tous les principes de l'orthographe étymologique, et de soulager les mots empruntés au grec de leurs vaines lettres parasites. Un mot étranger ne peut devenir entièrement français que si rien ne rappelle plus

son origine : on devra, autant que possible, en effacer toutes les traces' (p. 71).

[It is not true that *épilencie* is a French modification of *épilepsie*. It is from the late Latin *epilencia*, *epilepsia*, representing the late Greek *ἐπιλημψία*, with *μ* borrowed from the present stem of *λαμβάνω*.]

In Chapter VI the special recipes for this 'simple opération de nettoyage' are given, following Italian precedent, which he praises. We cannot follow into the details, but quote: 'Il y a dans les langues une beauté visible que l'on diminue en introduisant dans la cité verbale des figures étrangères, des voix dissonantes. . . . Mais cette beauté du vocabulaire, on ne la diminue pas moins en proscrivant la variété individuelle dans la permanence du type, et c'est là l'erreur des phonétistes, et le danger de leurs théories. (Il ne s'agit pas de savants qui étudient la phonétique)' (p. 81).

Chapter VII. Considering the salvation of pure French, unmixed with ill-assimilated foreign words, our author regrets the days when France imposed its speech on other nations (as he says England does now), and when a Frenchman learned no other language than his own. Let our youth, he says, learn Latin, but no other foreign speech. Latin is a good watch-dog : and let us admit no words but those attired *à la française*. 'Les peuples bilingues sont presque toujours des peuples inférieurs . . . Je résumerai en un mot ma pensée: le peuple qui apprend les langues étrangères, les peuples étrangers n'apprennent plus sa langue' (p. 90).

[This from the *Manchester Guardian*, July 18, 1921:

Henri Rochefort may be responsible for the legend that Victor Hugo would not learn English for fear of sullying the purity of his French style. 'Hugo told me (relates Rochefort) that he regretted his folly in learning Spanish. "If you want to retain a mastery of your native tongue (he went on to say) avoid any acquaintance with other modern languages!"' This advice seems to have borne fruit, for Rochefort confessed to Mr. Cunningham Graham that all the English he acquired during his six years' exile in London consisted of two brief sentences for the benefit of his

coachman: '*Tom, drive to Christie's*,' and '*Tom, drive home.*'] (ED.)

Chapter VIII is on assimilation. He again praises Italian practice, and incidentally the French marine words. 'Très peu de mots marins appartiennent au français d'origine; ils ont été empruntés aux langues germaniques et scandinaves, au provençal, à l'italien; mais leur naturalisation est parfaite, et presque tous peuvent servir de modèle pour le traitement auquel une langue jalouse de son intégrité doit soumettre les mots étrangers' (p. 102).

Chapter IX, on the same subject, deals chiefly with English words; a subject illustrated in our last Tract.

Chapter X is on what can be done or should be attempted in practice, and what the aim of any academic interference should be.

'Son rôle serait, non pas d'entraver la vie de la langue, mais de la nourrir au contraire, de la fortifier et de la préserver contre tout ce qui tend à diminuer sa forme expansive. Elle agirait dans le sens populaire, contre le pédantisme et contre le snobisme; elle serait, en face des écorcheurs du journalisme et de la basse littérature, la conservatrice de la tradition française, la tutrice de notre conscience linguistique, la gardienne de notre beauté verbale' (p. 116).

On the probable result of free mutual adoption of loan-words among the nations he writes:

'Un patois européen sera peut-être la conséquence inévitable d'un état d'esprit européen, et aucun idiome n'étant assez fort pour dominer, ayant absorbé tous les autres, un jargon international se faconnera, mélange obscur et rude de tous les vocabulaires, de toutes les prononciations, de toutes les syntaxes' (p. 120).

Remy de Gourmont then enters into a long illustration of the deformation of French words, where we cannot accompany him: but wish to note two of his remarks. One is that slang is encouraged by the pedantry which enforces a cultivated literary standard on a section of the people who most of all are determined to speak their own tongue. 'L'instruction obligatoire a fait du français, dans les bas-fonds de Paris, une langue morte, une langue de parade que le peuple ne parle jamais et qu'il finira par ne plus comprendre; il aime l'argot qu'il a appris tout seul, en liberté; il hait le français qui n'est plus pour lui que la langue de ses maîtres et de ses oppresseurs' (p. 133).

‘N'est-elle pas très curieuse cette civilisation qui fait enseigner le français à un enfant de l'Isle-de-France par un paysan auvergnat ou provençal muni de diplômes?’ (p. 137).

Lastly, the other is:

‘L'aristocratie intellectuelle, au lieu de restreindre la part du nouveau dans la langue, doit, au contraire, souffler au peuple abruti par les écoles primaires les innovations verbales qu'il est désormais inapte à imaginer’ (p. 132).

All these remarks are very pertinent to our own situation.

M. B.

N. B.—The square-bracketed comments in the above where not initialled as Editorial are by Dr. Henry Bradley.

NOTE ON ‘AS TO’

THIS has a legitimate use—to bring into prominence at the beginning of a sentence something that would without it have to stand later (*As to Smith, it is impossible to guess what line he will take*) ; it has, for instance, been wrongly omitted in: *Whether the publishers will respond to Sir Charles Stanford's appeal or not it is too early to speak with any confidence*. A spurious imitation of legitimacy occurs when *as to* introduces what would even without it stand at the head of the sentence, as in: *As to how far such reinforcements are available this is quite another matter* ; omit ‘*as to*’ and ‘*this*’, and the order is unaffected ; the writer has chosen to get out of the room by a fire-escape when the door was open.

Apart from this, it is usually either a slovenly substitute for some simple preposition (*Proper notions as to [of] a woman's duty* ; *She had been sarcastic as to [about] his hunting* ; *Piece of business as to [upon] which Dr. Thorne had been summoned* ; *Bantered himself as to [on] his own want of skill* ; *The manufacturer complains that everything as to [concerning] the future is left to the whim of the Board of Trade* ; *A singular degree of rarity prevails as to [among] the earlier editions of this romance*), or entirely otiose (*The only points on which the Government found fault were [as*

to] the Permanent Settlement and [as to] the system on which . . .; You ask the pertinent question [as to] how many of the doctors who signed the pledge were practising; It appeared to be somewhat uncertain [as to] whether the new docks scheme would be commenced at the Tilbury or the Albert Dock end; Asked [as to] what effect the arrest of the players would have on the American tour, Mr. Yeats said . . .; With the idea of endeavouring to ascertain [as to] this; Doubt is expressed [as to] whether this will affect the situation; The question [as to] upon whose shoulders the burden of the cost would rest; The question [as to] how far the Sultan will . . .).

As might be expected, those who put their trust in a phrase that is usually either vague or otiose are constantly betrayed by it into positive bad grammar: *Unless it has some evidence as to whom the various ideas belong* (i. e. as to to whom); *A different dance according as to whether the child is a male or a female* (i. e. according as the child is); *It is open to doubt as to what extent individual saving prevails*, and *No two people seem to agree* as to what extent *it is one country and one race* (i. e. as to to what extent); *It is not quite clear as to what happened* (This implies the ungrammatical *As to what happened is not clear* instead of the normal *What happened is not clear*); *The question does not relate solely to the possibility of Mr. Whitaker accepting appointment, but also as to whether any more suitable candidate can be suggested* ('relate as to'?—relativity would seem to be as upsetting to Priscian as to Euclid). The popular favourites: *The question as to whether, The doubt as to whether*, may almost be included among the ungrammatical developments, since the doubt or question demands an indirect question in simple apposition; in such forms as *Doubts are expressed as to whether*, the 'as to' is not incorrect, but merely repulsive; *An interesting question therefore remains as to how far science will provide us with the power* may lawfully be written; *The interesting, &c*, may not.

H. W. FOWLER.



NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Subscribers are warned that the subscription for 1922 is now due, and that the tracts for the current year will not be forwarded to them until it has been paid.

The Secretary being absent from England, all communications should be addressed to Mr. Robert Bridges, Chilswell, near Oxford, and the subscription (10s.) for the year should be sent direct to him.

The Committee regret that they have been unable punctually to fulfil their intention of issuing four tracts in the year, nor do they foresee that they will be able to make up for lost time by a fuller production this year; but they hope to do so. To meet the present conditions Tract VIII will provisionally be treated as a sandwich tract, and will be supplied to new subscribers for 1922 as well as to the old subscribers of 1921.

S. P. E.

TRACT N^{o.}. IX

THE LANGUAGE OF ANATOMY

By

Wm. Cuthbert Morton, C.B.E., M.A., M.D.

Edited, with an Introduction, by

Robert Bridges, M.B., F.R.C.P.

CORRESPONDENCE

&c.



*Oxford University Press
London: Humphrey Milford*

First edition 1922

Reprinted 1934, photographically in Great Britain by
LOWE & BRYDONE, LONDON

THE LANGUAGE OF ANATOMY

BY WM. CUTHBERT MORTON, C.B.E., M.A., M.D.

EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
ROBERT BRIDGES, M.B., F.R.C.P.

THE gist of the following paper is to offer practical suggestions for the Englishing of the terminology of anatomical science, which is the basis of our surgical and medical terminologies in so far as they deal with the human body and not with causes and cures of diseases and the other various objects involved in pathology and treatment.

The general relations of scientific terminology to common speech may be assumed. It is recognized that the main field of scientific terminology lies outside the province of language with which our *Tracts* profess to deal, and that each science has its own peculiar linguistic problem; but in one respect the sciences are all alike and all irrevocably bound to submit to fundamental linguistic proprieties, inasmuch as in all of them their terminology starts from a few objects which are well known and have common names in any national speech, and proceeds to innumerable objects which are unknown outside the special science and are *international* in the sense in which science is or should be international. The problem of differentiating, naming, and classifying these innumerable unfamiliar objects may require an elaborate mechanical verbiage which sets the aesthetic of national speech at defiance, but the fundamental speech-elements for the science are national property, and their relation to aesthetic speech should be preserved and jealously guarded.

It is also beyond question that scientific terms are far too numerous to have any chance of admission into the common vocabulary; and that therefore from the point of view of national speech it is foolish to be aesthetically troubled about them: they are outside and must establish their own proprieties and conveniences for themselves on their own lines; and if ever any one of their uncomfortably labelled objects should force itself into general recognition, then common

talk may be trusted to deal with its name and make a household word of it. But nevertheless, apart from general propriety, which we should do our best to secure, there is, between the basic national vocabulary and the extreme recondite differentiations of unfamiliar things, a margin of words which it is important to keep in order; because many of them are striving to come into use; and a good method of nomenclature will give them a decent dress, and thereby encourage their approach and make their advent welcome.

Assuming these main conditions we may consider the special condition of our anatomical science; and our first remark will be that the basis of national speech on which it rests is peculiarly rich and wide, inasmuch as the very numerous parts of the body are commonly possessed and many of them are known to all of us, and have universally recognized names in our common speech: and thus we see that Anatomy offers a favourable field for the discussion of scientific nomenclature, and that our undertaking should have valuable results both theoretical and practical; theoretical because the propriety of a sound nomenclature will have a wide and convincing appeal, and practical because of the great number of medical students who are hindered in their work by a bad method, and are also actively engaged in assimilating the terms of their special knowledge into everyday speech.

If therefore we should be successful in our suggestions, we may hope not only to do a good work in helping to 'English' a branch of scientific terminology which happens to be in actual controversy and difficulty, but we shall also incidentally exhibit an example of right general procedure: though it must be kept in mind that the difficulties and conveniences of the different sciences are all different and that a propriety which is possible in one may not be equally so in another. The actual condition of anatomical terminology at the present day in England, in what respects it is hampered by old convention or by recent attempts to improve it, will appear in our discussion so far as it is needful to consider it.

I. Proceeding then upon our first principle, namely, that the science has a wide basis of good wholesome English in such names as *head, neck, chest, thigh, leg, knee, ankle, foot, wrist, hand, &c.*, it is a first rule that such English words should always be used in preference to any foreign terms.

II. But why then, having *neck* and *thigh*, &c., does Anatomy speak of *cervical* and *femoral*, &c.? We are here face to face with a problem that is conditioned by our national speech: that is to say, the problem is different in English from what it is in German or French; it depends on the structure of our national speech and we shall do well to be clear about the actual definite conditions which must determine our practice.

The simple fact is, of course, that we are unable to make English adjectives out of English nouns by adding English suffixes to them. When driven to make an adjective which shall be correspondent to a substantive we use the substantive adjectively: and thus, and without inconvenience, we call the bone of the thigh the *thigh bone*, and no one can say whether *thigh* is here adjective or substantive, and we join the two words together, with or without a hyphen, and write *thighbone* or *thigh-bone* as one word. If printed as two separate words they reveal the poverty of our accidence, and when there is no difference whatever between our nouns and adjectives any complicated use of the adjective leads to trouble.¹

It is greatly owing to this defect in our speech that we have introduced so many Latin adjectives into our common vocabulary. For instance, we could not well do without *manual* as the common adjective of *hand*. Though we have *handy* it means something different. We speak of *manual labour* and *manufacture* and *handwork* and *handiwork*, and can also have *surgery*, which is only Greek for handwork, being through the old French *cirurgie* nothing but the Greek *χειρουργία*.

And the free borrowing of these Latin adjectives, such as *manual* and *mental*, has so domesticated their foreign forms that we do not scruple to set Romance suffixes to our English words, and we have *eatable*, *talkative*, *wondrous*, &c. (and no less good nouns, as *streamlet*, *huntrress*, *hindrance*, *bondage*, *endeavrement*, *knavery*, *oddity*), but such hybrids are exceptions and, even if we would, we cannot possibly treat our English words generally in that way. Nevertheless the health and beauty of our living hybrids should warn us against being pedantically scrupulous about new and unfamiliar examples.

¹ 'Poverty of our accidence' is a just term, but since some readers may resent it we would not pass it without apology: not to interrupt Dr. Morton's argument here we refer to a separate note on p. 20.

There is therefore nothing peculiar or unEnglish in the use of such Latin words as *cervical* and *crural* for the adjectives of *neck* and *leg*: the difference is that in Anatomy such words are more frequently used than in common speech, wherein some of them can have no place. But there are words of this class that are familiarly spoken, like *dental* and *gastric*; while in all literature there are many that seem indispensable and are on the border between scientific and common speech; such are *cardiac*, *cerebral*.

Of all these words it is to be noted that while in their simplest applications they might be easily avoided by manipulating the common speech words, yet their convenience is universal, and indispensable in the making of compounds descriptive of relation; and *ileocaecal valve* is quite as good English as *Franco-German War*: though we happen to talk more of the latter.

Again a characteristic of these adjectives is that in science they have a tendency to introduce a recognition of the noun from which they derive. The wrist, for example, has so many structures named from their relation to it (carpal arteries and ligaments, radio-caipal joint, &c.) that it is impossible to ignore *carpus*; and so *wrist* and *carpus* are used indifferently and often both in the same sentence, although in common speech *carpus* must be a solecism.

And likewise structures that have failed to attain clear differentiation in common speech tend to secure it by their Latin names. For instance, the two bones of the lower leg, the *shin* and the *spele-bone*, are called in Latin *tibia* and *fibula*—that is, the flute (or pipe) and the brooch-pin—, and as from these nouns we have taken the convenient adjectives *tibial* and *fibular*, so the nouns *tibia* and *fibula* have in Anatomy altogether supplanted the English names, concerning which there is some confusion. And here it may be incidentally observed how great an advantage it is to be able to use such names without the irrelevant association of their original meaning—just as *iceberg* is incomparably better than *icehill*—; and we may judge of the gain in this particular case by imagining a Roman matron hearing from her little daughter that her distressing growing-pains were only in her flutes and brooch-pins.

All nomenclature has always been so difficult that man has seldom been able to avoid the childish device of naming a new object by the old name of some familiar object with which he fancies it to bear a peculiar resemblance: so that

the new object does not get a new name but usurps the prescriptive title and inheritance of an old term, thus clogging the connotation and clarity of language. And so it comes about that Babel, if it lead to a fusion of tongues, is so far from being a *confusion* (in the common meaning of that word) that it actually clarifies a language by becoming a market of loan-words from which any nation can freely supply itself with good names of simple definite signification.

For instance, the Latin name of an object, which may in that language be a bad name, because it is also the name of a better known object, and is therefore foolish or ambiguous or both, may become a good distinctive name if it is loaned, as we say, into English, where its primary meaning is unknown or forgotten, as in *tibia*. There is therefore a good reason to welcome such foreign names into English as a general principle, and the essence of the propriety is that such a word should keep its original form ; to translate it only reintroduces its objectionable quality. Thus *tibia*, if we want a word for that bone, is better than flute or flute-bone (as *fibula* is better than *brooch-pin*) and it has the further advantage of being able to stand alone without the addition of the word *bone*, and also of being the same word with its indispensable adjective.

In this particular instance, however, which we have taken for an example, the use of the words *tibia* and *fibula* contravenes our first rule, since for those bones we possess the English names *shin* and *spele-bone* : and these names have a first claim, nor is it quite evident why *shin* is not so well recognized as 'thigh' and 'wrist'. The cause is probably a concurrence of accident with ignorance ; for in the horse *shin* is a metacarpal, and, like *shank*, has specific meaning in the kitchen ; and as *shank* in man is sometimes used as *leg* is for the whole lower limb, so *shin* may include both the leg-bones, though probably only because the existence of the lesser bone is unsuspected, being generally unknown or disregarded. However, *tibia* and *fibula* do not at present sound like English words, and *shin* is so impregnably established that if it cannot hold its own in Anatomy against *tibia* it is probably the uncomparative anatomy of butchers that is keeping it out.

We may therefore be satisfied that the abundant Latin terminology in Anatomy is in close relation with our common talk, and in its simpler examples merely an

extension of it, and defensible as an extension necessary for scientific purposes: but as this extension proceeds, it soon gets out of touch with English and escapes beyond control, and by virtue of the history of the Latin language becomes international, and a convenient instrument for European workers of all nations, who are fortunately able to use it in common.

After these introductory remarks we may proceed, re-stating Dr. Morton's first two rules for anatomical nomenclature.

§ i. Science writes and speaks in the national language and should employ national terms wherever they are suitable.

§ ii. When national terms fail Science uses Latin or Greek terms.

§ iii. Latin nouns even when they retain their Latin forms become English words, and many take on an English form.

This is in harmony with our common speech, for such words as *stimulus*, *camera*, *stratum* have not changed their form in becoming English, whereas *pars* has been changed into *part*, *canalis* into *canal*, *cubiculum* into *cubicle*. So in Anatomy, *tibia*, *femur*, and *cuneus* have become English without change, whereas *nervus* gives place to its English form *nerve*, *clavicularia* has been changed into *clavicle*, and *tuberculum* into *tuberclle*.

The English forms are in almost every instance preferable, but Latin forms are acceptable, and if any one of them happened to become really familiar it might still perhaps have a chance of acquiring an English form.

§ iv. Greek nouns even when they retain their Greek form become Latin, and so, following the rule for Latin words, become English.

In the English of daily life a Greek noun may become English in either its Greek or its Latin form, or else it may take on an English form. Thus *panorama* is Greek in form, *chrysanthemum* is Latin in form, while *theatron* and *chasma* have been changed into the English forms *theatre* and

chasm. So too in Anatomy *chorion* is Greek in form, *thalamus* is Latin in form, while *mesenchyma* has been replaced by the English form *mesenchyme*. There can be no hard-and-fast rule, yet English forms should always be adopted when they are congenial. We speak of *enzyme* and *mesenchyme*, and we might well bring *parenchyma* and *ependyma* into line. A Greek noun may thus form its adjective either with a Greek or with a Latin termination: for example, *condyle* should have *condylic*, but *condylar* is much more usual and having been preferred is probably preferable. *Condylloid* is very common, but *-oid* should be kept for the specific sense of formal likeness, as in *ovoid*, which is *egg-like*. On the whole the Latin adjectival terminations are to be preferred to the Greek, e. g. *mesenchyma* becomes *mesenchyme* with *mesenchymal* instead of *mesenchymatic*; but if we go on to ask whether *zygoma* should become *zygome*, with *zygomal* instead of *zygomatic*, we must recognize with what subtle influences we are dealing. *Zygome* is uncongenial. Even the French have left *zygoma* alone (Littré); and Milne-Edwards who keeps *zygomatique* calls the bone *os jugal* or *os de la pommette*; and if this is the received French use, we might follow it and call the bone the *jugal* bone. *Zygoma* is an ugly duckling: while of *systéma* we make *system* and take *systematic* readily, and are delighted with *aroma* and *aromatic*, *zygoma* and *zygome* are repellant.

The meticulous purism which would insist on Greek and Latin nouns always retaining their proper linguistic suffixes is inadmissible: even in common speech we eschew *theatric*, *practic*, &c.; and it is really much better to have well-sounding than archaically correct words. Chemistry has made great use of the different possible suffixes for scientific specification, determining that one special suffix shall be used for one special form of combination, and another for another; and as the names of the elements, which are from all sources, vary their suffix with their chemical combination, every possible kind of verbal hybrid may occur; and these are often valuable names of quite common objects.¹ In

¹ Illustration of the use which is made of these suffixes in Chemistry may be acceptable to our lay readers.

All newly discovered metals are given names ending in *-um*, whatever be the derivation of the name itself (e. g. *barium*, *chromium*, Greek; *calcium*, Latin; *platinum*, Spanish; *thorium*, Scandinavian; *strontium*, Scotch). Names of non-metals do not end in *-um*.

The names of chemical compounds indicate their composition. The termi-

Medicine the suffix *-itis*, which in Greek medicine was used to signify disease of an organ, as in *arthritis* and *rachitis*, has similarly been adopted to specify inflammation (whatever that may be), and when *appendicitis* became a fashionable disease, there was quite an outcry against the barbarity of the term, because *appendix* is Latin. But the word is quite in order—on the other hand *lithitis* which some one proposed lately is indefensible, because it would mean inflammation of a stone, not inflammation caused by a stone.

¶ v. No structure should have more than one Latin (or Greek) name.

In many of the books at the present time several of the bones have two names, e. g. (1) *trapezium* and *os multangulum majus*, (2) *os magnum* and *os capitatum*, (3) *scaphoid* and *os naviculare*. It does not matter in the least whether a boat-shaped bone is named the *scaphoid* or the *navicular*, but it is important that the same bone should not have both names. Best of all would be either *scapha* (Greek and Latin) or *navicle* (Latin), each meaning *boat*.

Just as in daily life equivalent Latin and Greek words may be used for quite different things (e. g. *manual labour* and *chirurgery*), so in Anatomy the eye has two *chambers* or *camerae* (Latin),¹ while the brain has a *thalamus* (Greek) which also really means a chamber, and the same object may have both a Greek and a Latin adjective which may cover different ground. Thus the lesser leg-bone has two adjectives, *fibular* (Latin) and *peroneal* (from *peronē* the old Greek and to-day the French name for the bone); and *peroncal* though not necessary has established itself usefully, distinct from *fibular*.

¹ nation *-ide* typically applies to a compound of two elements; *-ate* to one containing these two elements and oxygen; *-ite* to one containing less oxygen than the *-ate* compound (e. g. sulphide, sulphate, sulphite). Different proportions of constituent elements are indicated by the suffixes *-ic* and *-ous* (e. g. sulphuric and sulphurous acids, ferric and ferrous oxides), or more precisely by the Greek prefixes *mono-*, *di-*, *tri-*, &c. (e. g. triferric tetroxide).

In the terminology adopted by the Chemical Society of London the suffix

-ane indicates a normal paraffin (e. g. pentane);

-ene indicates a homologue of the ethylene series;

-ol indicates an alcohol (thus 'glycerol' is used instead of 'glycerine', because the substance is chemically an alcohol);

-ine indicates a basic substance (e. g. aniline, morphine);

-in is restricted to certain neutral compounds and proteins (e. g. 'albumin' is used instead of 'albumen', and 'protein' instead of 'proteid').

¹ For the use of Latin and Greek plurals in English see Tract III p. 5.

§ vi. In two-worded names it is best to avoid putting two Latin or Greek words together.

Names that are made of two words are composed in all possible ways. When they are a noun and an adjective, and are not both English, the adjective may be a Latin or Greek word in English dress, e.g. for *musculus deltoideus* we have *deltoid* muscle, for *arteria subclavia* we have *subclavian* artery, for *stratum granulare* we have *granular* layer or *granular* stratum. Often an adjective in Latin or Greek form is distinctive enough to be used in place of its noun. Thus for *musculus biceps* (the two-headed muscle) we need only *biceps*, for *musculus latissimus* we need only *latissimus*. *Biceps* and *latissimus* are now not Latin adjectives but English nouns.¹

In ordinary English a few two-worded Latin names are found. In *Aurora borealis* there is an appropriate recognition of rarity and mystery, and in *Alma Mater* an especial affectionate reverence can assume knowledge of Latin. And in Anatomy *mater* has kept Latin adjectives to distinguish the three membranes which enclose and protect the brain, of which the outermost being tough and fibrous is the *dura mater* (tough mother), the middle being spider-web-like is the *arachnoidea mater* (spider-like mother), and the innermost which carries the fine blood-vessels and so feeds the brain is the *pia mater* (dutiful mother). These terms are awkward because they give no satisfactory adjectives. Thus one standard text-book has the adjectives *dural*, *arachnoidal*, and *pia-matral*. The three membranes are, however, often called simply the *dura*, the *arachnoid*, and the *pia*, so that *mater* may well be dropped, and the adjectives would then be *dural*, *arachnoidal*, and *pial*,² or if *arachnoid* (spider-like) were replaced by the more direct and simple *arachne* (spider) we should have *dura*, *arachne*, and *pia* with *dural*, *arachnal*, and *pial*. Another example of shortening may be given. It is a common anatomical trick to name a thing indirectly, e.g.

¹ *O. E. D.* does not recognize 'latissimus'.

² We do not hold a brief for *pial*, but an objector may be asked whether he objects to *mental*, and what he would have said of *manual* if it had no classical authority. How will he defend *vernalis* (*ver*) and *vernalis* (from *verna*), &c.? 'This -ilis (proper to I- and IO-stems) as well as -alis (proper to A-stems) is often extended by analogy' (Lindsay); and if such words did not offend the ears of poets and orators in the Augustan age, is it not rather ridiculous in us to be so easily shocked?

instead of *style* (*stylus*)¹ we have *styloid process* (*processus styloideus*), instead of *quadruplets* (*quadrigemini*) we have *quadruplet bodies* (*corpora quadrigemina*). Concise and fluent description is favoured by the direct terminology. Now in Anatomy we have many bones named directly, such as *radius* (spoke), *ulna* (ell), *tibia* (flute), *fibula* (brooch). Why should we not have *cuneus* (wedge) instead of *os cuneiforme* (cuneiform bone), *ethmus* (sieve) instead of *os ethmoidale* (ethmoidal bone), *cubus* (cube) instead of *os cuboideum* (cuboid bone), and the like? We should then have convenient adjectives, namely *cuneal ethmal cubal* instead of *cuneiform ethmoidal* and *cuboid*, and more satisfactory compounds, e.g. *cubo-cuneal* instead of *cubo-cuneiform* and *intercuneal* instead of *intercuneiform*. One writer actually speaks of the *corpora quadrigeminal bodies*!

§ vii. Latin and Greek are especially needed for forming compound adjectives (expressing relation).

Thus the *radio-ulnar* joints are the joints between the two bones of the forearm. The *ilio-femoral* ligament binds together the flank-bone and the thigh-bone. The *cervico-axillary* canal connects the neck and the arm-pit. This raises the question of hybrids.

§ viii. In the making of compound adjectives, hybrids between Greek and Latin or between either of these and English should be avoided but they cannot be excluded.

Such hybrids are found in the English of daily life, e.g. *automobile* (Greek-Latin), *bureaucracy* (French-Greek), *hyper-sensitive* (Greek-Latin), *interweave* (Latin-English). They are common in Anatomy and in Medicine and Surgery generally; and if *automobile*, why not *auto-suggestion*? Hybrid terminology is exemplified in connexion with the *stomach*, the *spleen*, and the *kidney*. These names are taken directly from ordinary English, which has itself however taken *stomach* indirectly and *spleen* directly from the Greek. But adjectives are needed, and they are *gastric* (Greek), *splenic* (Greek), *renal* (Latin). Now there are two

¹ There is often doubt as to whether this word is the Latin *stylus*, a pen, or the Greek *stylus*, a column; in modern use the two have been so confounded that one cannot tell from which of them any particular derivation is taken. We generally write *style* in English because of our homophone *stile* (a step-gate) which has no connexion with either.

ligaments, one from stomach to spleen, the other from spleen to kidney, so that these might well be *gastro-splenic* and *splenorenal* (in place of *lienorenal*) ; but while *spleen* is from the Greek, *ren* is from the Latin. Such hybrids in Anatomy are unavoidable in expressing the relation between two structures one of which has only a Greek and the other only a Latin name, as, for example, the *thalamus* (Greek) and the *cortex* (Latin), two parts of the brain ; *thalamo-cortical* is a hybrid, unless we remember that in Anatomy every Greek name by the rules of the game becomes Latin. so that its union with a thorough-bred Latin name results not in a hybrid but in a Latin term.

§ ix. Proper names may be sometimes conveniently used for names of objects. [They are even more conveniently used of conditions.]

The present British terminology has been gradually evolved in the course of more than two thousand years. Many of the terms are taken directly from the writings of Greek surgeons and physicians ; and some of the structures of the human body have been named after them, e.g. the *vein of Galen*. Such terms have some of the best qualities of good nomenclature : they are traditional, definite, picturesque, and easily remembered ; it would therefore be foolish to oust them without very good reason, but it is foolish to keep them when they are useless.

In Medicine a proper name is often convenient ; although 'Bright's disease' might be called 'nephritis' without loss, it would be difficult to find a short descriptive name for 'Addison's disease'. Proper names are chiefly of use in labelling a bundle of details that hang together : thus in Surgery 'Syme's amputation of the foot' is best named after its inventor. Again the common typical fractures, 'Colles' fracture' and 'Pott's fracture', which are always in their recurrences alike, because they are the direct effects of a similar cause on similar conditions and in all their details (which would take a page to describe), have to be accurately known,—these could have no better or simpler name than that of the surgeon who first differentiated them.

In Geography, Botany, and Zoology this offhand way of naming is an inevitable convenience, and it has led to various inevitable inconveniences and abuses ; but in Anatomy there can seldom be any actual need for it, and where there is no

actual convenience such names should be done away with. As an example of actual inconvenience is the *ileo-caecal valve* which separates two parts of the intestine (the *ileum* and the *caecum*) ; this has been known at different times and in different places as the *valve of Bauhinus*, the *valve of Tulpis*, and the *valve of Fallopius* : it is plainly an advantage to have a simple descriptive name in place of the embarrassing competition of these worthies.

§ x. A complete (Latin) international terminology is needed in Anatomy in order to equate the various national terminologies and to bring them into complete intelligible accord, but not to dispossess them of their native dress.

We have seen that in English we must take our simple and compound adjectives from the Latin : and if we take these from an international terminology, then they will be the same with those used in all countries that use that terminology.

Thus we have *neck*, *cervical*, and *cervico-axillary* corresponding with the international *cervix*, *cervicalis*, and *cervico-axillarius* ; but (1) we shall not call the neck *cervix*, nor (2) shall we take the Latin forms of the adjectives, and say *cervicalis* for *cervical*, &c., any more than we call the 'sciatic nerve' *nervus ischiadicus*.

The sort of adjustment that is desirable, and the simple advantage of it, may be seen in the following example : There are two muscles in the forearm known as *Pronators*, one of which is round and the other square. The noun we take as it is and make an English word of it—pronation and supination are good English words—, but in our present nomenclature the two muscles are known as *pronator teres* and *pronator quadratus* and in French *le rond pronateur* and *le carré pronateur*. What we should do is to call our *p. teres* 'the round pronator', in French it would be '*le rond pronateur*', in German '*der runde Pronator*', in Italian '*il rondo pronatore*' ; and thus the Latin international, if it were, changed from its present form *p. teres* to *p. rotundus* would serve its full purpose, and the Englishing of the Latin name would actually make it more international.

It is a strange mistake to suppose, as some argue, that by use of the Latin forms of the Latin words of the international we shall in any way facilitate 'international inter-

course'. There is nothing to be gained by it, for unless we shall all talk Latin again there can be no 'intercourse' without the common knowledge of a modern language; a sprinkling of intelligible scientific terms in a discourse the language of which is unintelligible can serve no purpose whatever: and if one knows enough of the language to understand the discourse, then the naturalized scientific terms will be as easy to understand as their full Latin equivalents.

Indeed, supposing that there should be no Latin international terminology agreed on, with which separate nations could all equate their terms, we could arrive at one by gradually bringing the native variants into accord and then putting the result into Latin.

§ xi. The Austro-German Latin terminology is claimed to be, but is not really, international in origin.

This Latin terminology originated in Germany in 1887 and was formally adopted in 1895. It was decided that 'Each term shall be in Latin and be philologically correct' and that 'The terms shall be merely memory signs and need lay no claim to description or to speculative interpretation,'¹ as its supporters loudly proclaim. Thus Professor Barker of Washington states that 'The terms are all in correct Latin', which can easily be disproved, and also that 'Each name has a definite and easily ascertainable meaning', which is truly remarkable if the terms are 'merely memory signs and need lay no claim to description or to speculative interpretation'. Nevertheless the Austro-German terminology did excellent work in that at one stroke it reduced the number of terms current in Austria and Germany in those days, from thirty thousand to five thousand.

§ xii. The Austro-German terminology insists on the use of the Latin terms.

This terminology suffers from an almost mediaeval servitude to latinity. Thus Professor Barker of Washington, a strong advocate, writes 'Each anatomist is of course at liberty to use whatever English equivalent he desires for

¹ These quotations are from *Anatomical Terminology, with special reference to B. N. A.*, by L. F. Barker, 1907.

the official Latin terms. Students are strongly advised, however, to use the original Latin terms as English words. The Latin terms are the only authorised ones.' This baleful influence is seen throughout the description of the human body, as witness the following example from a standard text-book (Quain).¹

'The articulations of the ribs with the vertebrae (articulationes costo-vertebrales) are divided into articulationes capitulorum or costo-central and articulationes costo-transversariae or costo-transverse.

'Anteriorly, the costal cartilages are connected to the sternum by the articulationes sterno-costales and with one another by the articulationes interchondrales. The three portions of the breast bone are united by the articulationes sternales'.

If we de-Latinize this description, it becomes :

'The articulations of the ribs with the vertebrae are divided into the articulations of the heads or costo-central and the articulations of the ribs with the transverse processes or costo-transverse.

'Anteriorly, the costal cartilages are connected to the sternum by the sterno-costal articulations and with one another by the interchondral articulations. The three portions of the breast bone are united by the sternal articulations'.

If now we determinologize the description and merely state the facts, leaving the intelligent reader to supply the formal names and the student to learn them *viva voce*, we have :

'The ribs are joined with the vertebrae,—their heads with the centra, and their tubercles with the transverse processes. In front, the rib-cartilages are jointed with the sternum and with each other, while the three parts of the sternum are also united by joints.'

§ xiii. The Austro-German terminology has been widely adopted throughout the world.

It is at present used in the United States of America and in many of the Dominions, and it has within recent years

¹ The underlining of the words is not taken from Quain's book; it is used to isolate the different terms for convenience of reader.—[ED.]

been adopted by a considerable number of anatomists in Great Britain and Ireland.

In Britain the Austro-German terminology flourishes side by side with the British, and a large number of students have practically to learn both. Some years ago one of the popular manuals of practical anatomy suddenly changed from the British to the Austro-German, since which date students who use this manual have to know both terminologies. An example in detail will exhibit the present conditions.

The arm, forearm, and hand receive from a network known as the *brachial* or *arm-plexus* seven nerves, of which two are cutaneous (to the skin) and five mixed, that is to say musculo-cutaneous (to muscles and skin).

Let us take the two cutaneous nerves first. In the British terminology these are the *internal cutaneous* and the *lesser internal cutaneous* nerves, while in the Austro-German they are *nervus cutaneus antibrachii medialis* and *nervus cutaneus brachii medialis*, which is to say, being de-Latinized, the *medial cutaneous nerve of the forearm* and the *medial cutaneous nerve of the arm*. We might call them simply the *inner cutaneous of the forearm* and the *inner cutaneous of the arm*.

Of the five musculo-cutaneous or mixed nerves, one goes to the shoulder and four run down the arm. The nerve which goes to the shoulder supplies the great deltoid muscle and the skin of the shoulder. In the British this is the *circumflex* nerve, which is a good name since the nerve circumflexes or winds round the arm-bone. In the Austro-German it is the *nervus axillaris*, that is to say, the *axillary nerve*, which is a bad name since the nerve is less axillary than several other nerves of the axilla (arm-pit). We might call it simply the *nerve to the deltoid*.

Of the four musculo-cutaneous nerves which run down the arm there are (a) three anterior, and (b) one posterior. In the British these are (a) the *musculo-cutaneous*, *median*, and *ulnar* and (b) the *musculo-spiral*. *Musculo-cutaneous* is strange since they are all musculo-cutaneous. *Median* is bad since in Anatomy *median* is defined as *in the middle line of the body*. *Musculo-spiral* might well be shortened to *spiral*. In the Austro-German the four nerves are as in the British except that the posterior is *nervus radialis* or *radial nerve*, which is awkward since the British radial nerve is in the forearm and the real radial nerve of the limb is that

which is now known as the *musculo-cutaneous*. We might group the four *musculo-cutaneous* together as the *brachial nerves* being (a) three anterior, namely, the *outer*, the *middle*, and the *inner*, and (b) one *posterior*. We should then have the seven nerves thus

Cutaneous.

1. Inner of arm,
2. Inner of forearm.

Musculo-cutaneous, or brachial.

3. To the deltoid,
4. Outer
5. Middle } *anterior*,
6. Inner }
7. Spiral *posterior*.

instead of, as in the Manual (which for some reason which is not quite clear chooses to speak of the British as the Old Terminology):

1. *Nervus cutaneus brachii medialis* (O. T. Lesser Internal Cutaneous).
2. *N. cutaneus antibrachii medialis* (O. T. Internal Cutaneous).
3. *N. axillaris* (O. T. Circumflex).
4. *N. musculo-cutaneus*.
5. *N. medianus*.
6. *N. ulnaris*.
7. *N. radialis* (O. T. Musculospiral).'

This technical quotation may serve for an example of the latinizing craze of the advocates of the Austro-German terminology. Both terminologies abound in faults and they are irreconcilable. The Royal College of Surgeons of England has banned the Austro-German terminology.

It will be seen that the import of this disquisition is to condemn the action of those who are moving to introduce a *formal Latin international terminology* into the British schools of Anatomy, on the false notion that it will be of service to international science.

It is argued by us that such action is wrong in principle and harmful in practice, and that it cannot secure the advantages claimed for it.

We contend that all scientific nomenclature must have its basis in every national language, and that whatever classical

or foreign terms are introduced should be as far as possible adapted to the national speech.

It is not denied that the work done by the German Committee (B. N. A.) may be of great service. Any combined effort of experts to fix the names of objects that have been variously, confusedly, or awkwardly named is a first step towards the simplification and unification of nomenclature: and that is on all hands desired. But those who did this good work never themselves imagined that their attempt was final and in all details satisfactory, and while it should be fully considered and respected it should be left to the common sense of the workers to take or refuse any suggestion on its own merits. In any case common sense and convenience will in the end have their own way. There are, however, various measures of success, and since false steps always leave some mark, it is desirable that a wrong end should not be consciously pursued, nor wrong measures persistently adopted.

It is the object of our Society to advocate right principles, and in so far as we can, to give such practical information as will lead to right judgement.

NOTE ON 'THE POVERTY OF ENGLISH ACCIDENCE'.

What is meant by 'the poverty of English Accidence' (p. 5 above) is shown in the common absence of formal differentiation between the different parts of speech, nouns adjectives and verbs. That this is a practical inconvenience appears in the poor quality of average English prose, and also in a certain constraint and the deficiency of graceful variety in the diction of our best writers.

The kind of beauty which is forbidden to us may be exhibited in a single example, the beautiful collect for peace, which is the second in our evening prayer :

'O God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed. Give unto thy servants that peace which the world cannot give', &c.

This is a translation of

'Deus a quo sancta desideria, recta consilia et justa sunt opera; da servis tuis illam quam mundus dare non potest pacem', &c.

The English is good, but the artistic order of the Latin words, which in English would be an unintelligible disorder, assists and enforces the meaning without the slightest obscurity, and the words group themselves in a sort of dance figure, instead of a 'march-past'.

There is a philological school the function of which seems to be to praise the curtailing of our speech, and not only because suffering from it they would make the best of it, like the fox in the fable, but because they prize its real advantages; since the absence of distinction between the parts of speech, which follows from the loss of their grammatical inflexions, forces the words into their simple order and thereby enforces direct diction, which has thus come to be a sort of virile characteristic of English: nor again can any one deny that the simplification which has got rid of all the paraphernalia that, for instance, makes the conjugation of a Greek verb a ridiculous terror, has great advantages.

It is true, of course, that this same directness of speech is not impossible or forbidden in a highly inflected language; but since its rules of concord tend to impose similar

terminations on consecutive words, which, in Latin at least, has a very ill-sounding and weak effect, the simplest devices for separating these words are sure to be favoured, and inversions of the sentence will be used which have no other purpose or excuse than this euphony: and it is when such artificial diction is compared with the average uniformity of our direct diction that it is reasonable to prefer the latter.

Thus a writer in *The Times* says: 'Instead of being despised as it once was for its absence of inflexion, our native English is now praised for it'. Professor Jesperson is the chief apostle of this gospel.

We may gladly admit our gains and yet confess that we have lost too much. To me it seems that, apart from the objection that *loves* may be a verb or a substantive, *loveth* is a better word than *loves* [Lʌvz] and *doeth* than *does* [dʌz]. Again in our tendency to make one syllable of two, the resultant squash is often a bigger mouthful than the extended form. Surely *beasts*, with its *sts*, is no shorter than *beastes*, and it is certainly more difficult to speak. The old genitive of *God* was *Goddes*, and surely *Goddes grace* is easier than *Gods grace*: actually *Gods*, if fully pronounced, is a bigger word than *goddes*; it takes longer and is more difficult to say. There is a bigger D in it, and DZ is greater than DEZ.

Again we may judge of our losses by considering the beauty and advantage of the words which have escaped the general rules of uniformity and simplification. Suppose that for *geese*, *mice*, *oxen*, and *children* we had *gooses*, *mouses*, *oxes*, and *childs*. It would seem to common sense that we should do well if our modern English could recover a few more of the older forms as they live in our imperishable literature and linger in our perishing dialects, instead of still further grinding down our speech by careless pronunciation. When we laugh at a countryman for saying *beaste's*, do we remember that he has it in unbroken tradition from Chaucer's mouth? Our losses may be mostly irretrievable, but we may favour the retention of all old word-forms that enable us to vary the plod of our sentences; and it should not be overlooked that to avoid the ambiguities or unseemly crowding of uninflected words we are often constrained to insert into our sentences words which are needed neither for grammar nor sense, as above, where I found myself writing *simple order favours*, a useless auxiliary offered itself to comfort the verb; and in the collect quoted one may note

the periphrastic auxiliary *do*, which was probably encouraged to intrude by its usefulness in separating uninflected terms, especially when these were monosyllables, as in

Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May.

Under the tyranny of our disyllabic prosody it was a welcome resource, and so in the lovely lyric,

It was a lover and his lass,
 With a hey, and a ho, and a hey nonino !
 That o'er the green cornfield *did* pass
 In the Spring time, the only pretty ring time,
 When birds *do* sing, hey ding a ding ding ;
 Sweet lovers love the Spring.

Lovers love the spring and so may lassies, but lads would love their Love with a *doo*.

Having won this title to grace it was considered graceful in itself, and still survives in verse as a simple present and past indicative, though it has disappeared from cultured speech, except in negative, interrogative, and emphatic sentences.

It is due also to the 'poverty of our accidence' that, if we would secure the full force of our diction, we need great care to avoid any sequence of words which without special punctuation and apart from the context might be other parts of speech and so combine differently to make a different sense. Few writers are heedful of this, and it is a counsel of perfection: but even where the context so ensures the meaning and right reading that nothing else is suspected or consciously suggested, yet the lurking ambiguity will take the edge off the expression, because it unconsciously calls away some part of our attention.

R. B.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES AND CORRESPONDENCE

IN or ON A SHIP

A correspondent condemns the prevalent use of the phrase *on a ship* instead of *in a ship*, in the sense of being 'on board'.

There is no doubt that the invariable old use was *in*, and that *on* has only lately come into literature. The facts seem to have been collected and summarized by a writer in *The Mariner's Mirror* which we have not been able to come at, but it seems (from a notice of it in the *Morning Post*, some years ago) that the original writer could find no instance of *on* or *upon* until late in the sixteenth century, and that was by a civilian clerk. In the seventeenth century he found a very few instances of *on*, but he estimated the prevalence of *in* above *on* as at least ten thousand to one, and most of the *on* examples are in *borne on*, which probably meant 'on the ship's books for pay and victuals'.

On is now very common; a recent newspaper gives: 'The cause of the explosion *on* the ex-German super-submarine... but inasmuch as hydrogen gas is never carried *on* a British submarine, and that it was not known that it was *borne on* German under-water ships...', &c. The use of *on* even of submarines would show that it has altogether superseded *in*.

In is still the preposition used by sailors and seems invariable in the writings of our nautical authors and master mariners—Marryat, Dana, Whall and Conrad. Indeed Dana uses it of 'one of those singular things called catamarans. They are composed of logs lashed together upon the water, the men sitting with their feet in the water; have one large sail, are quite fast, and, strange as it may seem, are trusted as good sea-boats. We saw several, with from one to three men *in* each, boldly putting out to sea, after it had become almost dark. The Indians go out *in* them after fish' (*Two Years ch. iv*).

On would seem to be a passenger's word, and may perhaps be taken as short for *on board*; but it was likely

enough favoured by landsmen because they thought it sounded nautical, whereas *in* was ordinary talk.

Mr. John Masefield tells me that *on* is commonly used of a training-ship, and that sailors who have begun life *on a training-ship* continue their habit of saying *on* until they have been some months at sea.

No landsman would say that he was *on* an open boat, and it might be questioned whether modern shipbuilding has affected the preposition. *In* was secure so long as the deck was merely a roofing in of some part of the ship, but now that decks are complete solid floors it is natural to think of being *on* them. On the other hand the ship as it mitigated its discomforts became more and more like a house, and now in luxury emulates 'the huge hotel': and no one would talk of being *on a house* or *on a hotel*.

As for correctness of speech, if *on* is a landsman's modernism, *in* is likely to be preferred. As for propriety, *in* is indubitably better, and this can be shown thus: To be *in a ship on the sea* is excellent English, but to be *on a ship on the sea* is bad, not so much because of the awkwardness of the idea of superimposition which it suggests, as that the same preposition cannot be used twice in so short a phrase without implying similar relations, and the relations here are dissimilar.

[ED.]

RESPECTIVE AND RESPECTIVELY

These two words are much abused. Mr. Fowler sends us the following classification of their right and wrong uses:

'Examples may be sorted into five groups: A, in which the words give information needed by sensible readers; B, in which they give information that may be needed by fools; C, in which they say again what is said elsewhere; D, in which they are used wrongly for some other word; and E, in which they give a positively wrong sense.'

'A. RIGHT USES.'

'There are two other chapters in which Strauss and Debussy take respectively a higher and a lower place than popular opinion accords them. But for *r.*, the reader might suppose

that both composers were rated higher on some points and lower on others ; *r.* shows that *higher* goes with Strauss, and *lower* with Debussy.

'That training colleges for men and women respectively be provided on sites at Hammersmith and St. Pancras. But for *r.*, he might take both colleges to be for both sexes ; *r.* shows that Hammersmith is for men and the other for women.

'This makes it quite possible for the apparently contradictory messages received from Sofia and Constantinople respectively to be equally true. *R.* shows that the contradiction is not, e. g., between earlier and later news from the Near East, but between news from one and news from the other town

'B. FOOLPROOF USES.

*'The particular fool for whose benefit each *r.* is inserted will be defined in brackets.*

*'Final statements are expected to be made to-day by Mr. Bonar Law and M. Millerand in the House of Commons and the Chamber of Deputies respectively (*r.* takes care of the reader who does not know which gentleman or which Parliament is British, or who may imagine both gentlemen talking in both Parliaments).*

'The socialist aim in forcing a debate was to compel the different groups to define their respective attitudes (*the reader who may expect a group to define another group's attitude*).

'We have not the smallest doubt that this is what will actually happen, and we may discuss the situation on the footing that the respective fates of these two Bills will be as predicted (*the reader who has read the prediction without sufficient attention to remember that it is double*).

'C. TAUTOLOGICAL USES.

*'After each is given in brackets the expression or the fact that makes *r.* superfluous.*

'Having collected the total amount, the collector disburses to each proper authority its respective quota (*each .. its*).

'He wants the Secretary for War to tell the House in what countries they are at present stationed, and the numbers in each country respectively (*each*).

'Madame Sarah Bernhardt and Mrs. Bernard Beere respectively made enormous hits in "As in a Looking-glass" (*hits, plural*).

‘The October number of the *Rassegna* is chiefly remarkable for the respective articles of the Marchese Crispolto Crispolti on Pope Benedict V and the war and by the Marchese Colonna di Cesard on Zionism and the Entente (the mention of each article immediately after the author’s name).

‘In the *Preussische Jahrbucher* for May the most noteworthy articles are those respectively by Werner Weisbach, who writes on Germany in modern Italian political criticism, and by Professor Hans Delbrück, who contributes an extremely interesting comparison between . . . (as in the last).

‘D. R. FOR ANOTHER WORD.

‘The writers of these mean no more than *both* (to be placed in the second after *Fellow*).

‘The two nurses’ associations respectively organized in Scotland make no secret of their membership.

‘He was a Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, and of the University of London respectively.

‘E. REVERSAL OF SENSE.

‘It is recognized that far too little is known by Englishmen and Americans about their respective countries; in this country there is only one lectureship on American history, and that is at King’s College, Strand. This can only mean that Englishmen know too little of England, and Americans know too little of America—which is no doubt true, but is not the truth that the writer wished to convey; “about each other’s countries” would have served both writer and reader.

‘The simple fact is that *respective*(ly) are words seldom needed, but which a pretentious writer will drag in at every opportunity for the air of thoroughness and precision they are supposed to give to a sentence.’

H. W. F.

‘AS TO.’ See Tract VIII, p. 10

As to as to and as to as to whether, and whether there is the same objection to as to as to as to whether we have had several communications, and among them the following interesting quotations from eminent writers.

Bertrand Russell: *The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism*:

‘The uncertainty as to whether the desired goal will be reached in the end.’ p. 20.

'The first question I asked him was *as to how far* he recognised the peculiarity of English economic and political conditions'. p. 37.

'Whether, with the menace of foreign invasion removed, enough day-by-day detailed energy would exist for the re-organisation of industry, is a doubtful question, *as to which* only time can decide.' p. 87.

'Nothing produced a doubt in our governing minds *as to* the rightness of our policy except the strength of the Red army and the fear of revolution in Asia.' p. 21.

J. M. Keynes: *A Treatise on Probability*:

'Of which logical ideas and relations we have direct acquaintance, *as to whether* we can ever know directly the existence of other people, and *as to when* we are knowing propositions about sense-data directly, and when we are interpreting them—it is not possible to give a clear answer'. (why not *as to which*?)

From an article in *Co-Partnership*, March 1922, on 'Welfare Work':

'This was largely due to mental inertia, an instinctive dislike to change and a fear of the unknown; for it was unknown *as to where* such action would lead.'

Sir William Hamilton, *Reid's Works*:

'The variation of philosophers *in regard to which* of the two classes of Primary and Secondary they would refer them', (should be *in regard to to which*, like the *to to whom* and *to to what extent* quoted in last Tract, p. 11.)

Trollope, Barchester novels:

The following examples of *as to* (maid of all work) are repeated from Mr. R. W. Chapman's *Portrait of a Scholar*, p. 122.

'Proper notions *as to* a woman's duty.'

'Sarcastic *as to* his hunting.'

'Said a good word *as to* Dingles, and bantered himself *as to* his own want of skill.'

'A great impropriety, *as to* which neither could be got to assent.'



S. P. E.

TRACT No. X

Report of Society

The American Invitation

ON GRAMMATICAL INVERSIONS

By

H. W. Fowler

CORRESPONDENCE

&c.



At the Clarendon Press

M DCCCC XXXII

First published 1922

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY JOHN JOHNSON, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

REPORT

THIS delayed report of our Society would have taken a subordinate place after the usual topics of the Tract, but for the preeminent significance of 'The American Invitation', which is a proper part of it and dwarfs all other interests.

The aim of our Society from the first has been to secure the active co-operation of all the English-speaking peoples, and without American collaboration we could not hope for any great measure of success. The authoritative response therefore, which we are able to publish, is a matter of such congratulation and promise that we must give the first place to our Report, and leave our modest Balance-sheet to bring up the rear.

ON THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE SOCIETY

MEMBERSHIP

The original scheme of Membership, as projected in our first Tract, is now changed. It was at first thought advisable for the Society to establish itself by enrolling the names of all who would publicly support its aims, and those who gave it such support were styled Members. The list attained its purpose, but as its numbers increased it became at once useless and inconvenient, and it was decided to confine registration to those who would subscribe for the Tracts.

Members are now those who pay an annual subscription of ten shillings in advance. A list of their names and addresses is kept at the Press, and the Tracts are forwarded to them as they are published. For this year 1922, we have 150 members. This number does not represent the sale of the Tracts.

Our agent and secretary in America is Henry S. Canby, Editor of *The Literary Review of the New York Evening Post*. American correspondence should be addressed to him at 20 Vesey St., New York City.

FINANCE

That there has been no regular statement of accounts is due to the secretary's illness and long absences from England, and his deputy, besides other inconveniences, had no authority to draw on the banking account to meet current expenses. Moreover, the lack of time-relation between the outgoing payments and the returns from the sales would have made any show of balance illusory. The account now printed will give the information that is due to members about the finances of the society.

OBITUARY

We cannot refer to our original list of Members without notice of the many lamentable gaps that death has made in it during these few years. Among our losses we record the distinguished names of

REV. A. E. ABBOTT.	WALTER MORRISON.
RT. HON. SIR WM. ANSON.	SIR JAS. A H MURRAY.
VERY REV. DEAN BEECH- ING.	SIR WALTER RALEIGH.
F. G. FOWLER.	JOHN SARGEAUNT.
W. WARDE FOWLER.	J. E. TIDDY.
RT. HON. SIR ED. FRY.	MRS. HUMPHRY WARD.

SIR WALTER RALEIGH

Of these we are now most deeply deplored the untimely death of Walter Raleigh, an original member of our committee, who was closely associated with our work and by his countenance strengthen'd our purpose and assured our reputation with the public against any suspicion of scholastic pedantry. His record is elsewhere, and the various and brilliant imagination of his writings must set him high among the very few English critics whose style can secure them the attention of posterity. To the present generation his unique personality is not buried in the grave, for to all who ever had intercourse with him the image of his towering and sunny spirit will abide unfaded till the youngest of them has passed away. No man so widely known can have been more unexceptionally beloved. The liveliest and heartiest of companions, the truest of friends, he was also the best of patriots in this, that whatever expression

he gave to his love for England, it was like a life-beat of her own blood: and if as a lover he was indulgent to her faults, he had weighed her sins in with the *peccata mundi* and by the judgment of a wide humanity had founded his faith in her spiritual mission to the world. Had all the nations of the earth been leagued in war against us, he would not have lost heart; and so, in the war of tongues, his conviction of the present vigour and future promise of the English language was as complete as his pride in its past glories. It was this that reconciled him to plod in the Schools; for to such a hater of formalism the professorial chair was a narrow seat and no home for his roving mind. In that compulsory sphere of duty, the praise of his work may have a place in our records, for when called to Oxford he devoted his genius to teaching, and kindling the students with his own enthusiasm won for the modern subject of English letters a place of due dignity in the *humaniores*. He served Oxford for eighteen years and when death took him, the gloom that fell on a thousand homes was deepest there. As his wish was, he is succeeded by his pupil, George Gordon, in whom he early recognized a kinship of spirit.

JOHN SARGEAUNT

The death of John Sargeaunt on March 20 is another great loss to our Society. He was one of the few devoted workers who never grudged us his labour. His definition and advocacy of the traditional accentuation and pronunciation of our Latin words (Tract iv) will be of permanent value and it is hoped of immediate influence. It is just such a paper as our Society wishes to publish, being the correction of an abuse by exhibition of the principles that rule it out. Educated speakers are nowadays giving way to a habit of betraying in their speech a consciousness of the linguistic origin of our borrowed words by imitating their foreign pronunciation, and, as we have complained, good old words which have long been domesticated are now appearing in newspapers and books italicized as foreign words. This is a degrading of our language, a deformity and pollution of its purity; a fashionable affectation of culture or learning which is really an evidence of pedantic education. John Sargeaunt's life-work specially qualified him to deal with the Latin words: he was master of the Sixth form at Westminster from 1901 to 1919, and for that

time closely associated there in the production of the Latin play which has kept an unbroken tradition: he thus held a key to the problem, and his accurate scholarship and aesthetic interest enabled him to deal with it thoroughly. Some of the famous Latin prologues to the play were, we believe, from his pen, as were the witty englisings of them in the School Journal, *The Elizabethan*, in which there appeared a short account of his life [April 1922, vol. xvii, no. 2]. That record testifies to the high esteem and warm affection of his pupils and colleagues. In one of the most responsible posts which a teacher can hold, the unremitting influence of his high character was for eighteen years wisely and devotedly exercised. Conscious of his calling he worked modestly and in the fear of God; and though the good effects of such work are indistinguishable and unrecorded they are widespread and everlasting.

He edited several books and also published these original works:

A History of Felstead School. 1889.

Annals of Westminster. Methuen, 1898.

The Trees, Shrubs, and Plants of Virgil. Oxford, 1920.

A Verse Translation of Virgil's pastorals.

VISCOUNT BRYCE

To these we may add the honoured name of Lord Bryce, who though he was not on our original list had become a strong supporter. He wrote to the Society the day before his death, and from a letter written to me some days earlier about American co-operation I will quote a few words in evidence of his active goodwill:

'Lowell of Harvard would I should think be entirely sympathetic. . . His counsel would be that Americans should be induced either to join the S. P. E. and have an American branch thereof, with American office-bearers, or urged to establish a parallel Society of their own which would deliberate and co-operate with the British. Sometime when you are in London I should like a talk with you on the subject.'

It was no doubt partly due to his advocacy of our cause in America, that a group of learned Americans took it up, and surprised us by the hearty invitation which we print below. The terms of their letter and the authority of the signatories are all that could be desired.

“THE AMERICAN INVITATION.

The Right Honorable Sir Arthur James Balfour, K.G., &c.
 Sir Henry Newbolt, M.A., D. Litt., &c.
 Robert Bridges, D. Litt., F.R.C P., &c., Poet Laureate.

GENTLEMEN,

This seems to us a favorable time for the initiation of a concerted effort throughout the English-speaking world to maintain the traditions and foster the development of our common tongue. For this purpose we suggest the organization of a permanent international body of scholars and men of letters representing the principal English-speaking peoples. If this suggestion meets with your approval, we hope that you and others in Great Britain whom you may invite to cooperate—scholars, men of letters, and representatives of the learned societies in the mother country of our language—will, as is fitting, take the lead in furthering the project. With such a group on your side of the water a corresponding group on this side will, we are sure, hold it an honor to confer.

Will you and your associates be so kind as to reply to Professor Fred Newton Scott, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Faithfully yours,

Signed

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT.¹
 ALBERT STANBURROUGH
 COOK.²
 CHAS. HALL GRANDGENT.³
 ROBERT UNDERWOOD
 JOHNSON.⁴

March 1922.”

JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES.⁵
 JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY.⁶
 CHARLES GROSVENOR
 OSGOOD.⁷
 FRED NEWTON SCOTT.⁸

The several titles and professions of the signatories are taken from the American *Who's Who*.

¹ A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D. Caroline Donovan Prof. English Lit., Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore.

² Ph.D., Hon. M.A., L.H.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Prof. Eng. Lang. and Lit., Yale.

³ A.B., L.H.D., Prof. Romance Langs., Harvard.

⁴ B.S., Hon. Ph.D., Hon. A.M., L.H.D., Editor and Author. American Ambassador to Italy.

⁵ A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Prof. English, Harvard.

⁶ A.M., Ph.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Prof. English, Univ. Chicago.

⁷ B.A., Ph.D., Prof. English, Princeton Univ.

⁸ A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Prof. Rhetoric, Univ. of Michigan.

The formal response to this Invitation has been delayed, but the acting Secretary of the S.P.E. has been in communication with the American committee, and has had several interviews with their representative, Professor Scott, who has been in England. The task before us, of devising a machinery for transatlantic collaboration, is an extremely difficult one, and it cannot be foreseen how any agreement will affect the status of the S.P.E. For the present we shall carry on as usual, and hope to be able to report good progress in our next issue. In the meanwhile we appeal to other branches of 'the English-speaking peoples' to follow this example, and come forward to occupy their due places in the general polity by sending us corresponding overtures from their leading representatives.

[R. B.]

ON GRAMMATICAL INVERSION

BY H. W. FOWLER

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

WE receive a good many letters requesting us to protest against this or that bad habit of grammar as illustrated generally by our correspondents in one or two quotations from the newspapers; but we do not think this kind of desultory skirmishing is of value; and we would remind our readers of the method which we would adopt in dealing with any particular abomination. That method is, first to show the prevalence of the abuse; then, if possible, to classify the forms of it; and finally to confound it by an exposition of the grammatical or aesthetic rules or proprieties that it offends.

The following paper by Mr. Fowler on the abuse of common grammatical inversion is an example of such treatment, and though such treatises may not be as easy reading as the sort of comic invective by which orthodox sticklers relieve their feelings, we maintain that it should be more amusing, and is likely to be more persuasive.

It may be well to warn readers who might be at first misled by the general title of the paper, that it does not pretend to deal with Inversion in general, and entirely excludes the wider and more intricate subject of rhetorical and poetic inversion. It is concerned merely with *Inversion of the subject and verb in everyday writing*; its object being to formulate the various proper uses of simple grammatical inversion, to illustrate the commonest abuses, and demonstrate their uselessness, awkwardness, or absurdity. [ED.]

INVERSION

By this is here meant merely the abandonment of the usual English sentence order and the placing of the subject after the verb, as in *Said he*, or after the auxiliary of the verb, as in *What did he say?* and *Never shall we see his like again*. Inversion is the regular and almost invariable way

of showing that a sentence is a question, so that it has an essential place in the language; and there are other conditions under which it is usual, desirable, or permissible; but the abuse of it is among the most repellent vices of modern writing. Its conditions and motives are various, and cannot be set forth in a sentence; it seems better to postpone analysis, and try first to persuade the reader, by an exhibition of specimens, that inversion is often practised when it serves no useful purpose, that such inversion is ugly, and that resort to it is a mark of the unskilful writer. Here, then, are some bad inversions; the uninverted form is indicated by a word or two in brackets, and the reader is invited to decide for himself whether it would not have been in all these instances clearly better:

Then to the resident Medical Officer of the Brompton Hospital for Consumption for an authoritative opinion on the subject *went the inquirer*. (The inquirer then went, as the beginning of the sentence)

Sufficient *is it* to terminate the brief introduction to this notice by stating . . . (It is sufficient)

Appropriately *does the author* prelude his recollections with the story of . . . (The author appropriately preludes).

Somewhat in the nature of a blow *is it*, therefore, to find that . . . (It is therefore somewhat).

Hard *would it* be to decide which of his many pursuits in literary study he found most absorbing. (It would be hard.)

By diligent search in sunny and sheltered places *could* some short-stalked *primroses* be gathered (primroses could be gathered).

Little by little *are* these poor *people* being hemmed in and ground down by their cruel masters (people are being).

Gloomy though *is the precedent*, the only thing left for a War Lord to do is to follow the example of Ahab at Ramoth Gilead (the precedent is).

These were persons to be envied, as *might* be *some one* who was clearly in possession of a sixth sense (as some one might be).

With good peripheral railways, such as *have our invaders*, the front can be strengthened at any point (our invaders have).

A frigate *could* administer roughly half the punishment that *could a 74* (a 74 could).

Carrying far more than *can* the steam-driven *vessel* (vessel can).

He looked forward, as *do we all*, with great hope and confidence to . . . (we all do).

He laid down four principles on which alone *could America* go further (America could).

'I couldn't help liking the chap' *would shout Lingard* when telling the story (*Lingard would shout*).

Not only is it so necessarily bounded by that moving veil which ever hides the future, but also *is it* unable to penetrate more than a paltry hundred thousand years or so into the darkness that now enshrouds the past (*it is unable*).

An undefeated Prussia is ultimately the end of England, and, in particular, *is it* the end of fortune and security for... (*it is the end*).

Whether all of these inversions are bad, as they were said to be, or not, they can hardly fail to convince any one who reads them one after another that inversion is not an achievement to be aimed at for its own sake, as some of these writers evidently take it to be, but a means to be employed only when it is needed. Such a reader may now be willing to examine the occasions that demand it. The result will be something of this kind :

Inversion is the deferring of the subject till after (especially in older English) the verb, or till after (especially in modern English) the verb's auxiliary only : *What saith he?*, *What does he say?*, are both inversions, the uninverted forms being *he saith*, *he says*.

In QUESTIONS AND COMMANDS, as contrasted with the commoner form of sentence, the mere statement, inversion is the rule : *Doth Job fear God for nought?*; *Hear thou from heaven thy dwelling-place*. The subject being usually omitted in commands, these do not much concern us; but in questions the subject regularly follows the verb or its auxiliary except when, being itself the interrogative pronoun or adjective, it has to stand where that pronoun almost invariably stands [Browning's *Wanting is—what?* supplies an exception] : *Who did it?*; *What caused it?*. In the other exceptional sentence-form, the EXCLAMATION, inversion is not indeed the rule as in questions, but is, and still more used to be, legitimate : *How dreadful is this place!* *What a piece of work is a man!* *O bonnie was the rosy brier!* *Few and evil have the days of the years of my life been.* *Bitterly did he rue it.* *Bang went saxpence!*.

Inversion, then, is the natural though not universal order of words in sentences other than statements; in exclamations particularly, when they do not contain a special exclamatory word such as *how* or *what*, the inversion is what proclaims their nature; and one form of bad inversion arises from inability to distinguish between an exclamation and a mere statement, so that the latter is allowed the order that marks

the former (*Hard is it to decide*, on the pattern of *Hard, very hard, is my fare!*). To these three inverted forms of main sentence as described above must be added the HYPOTHETICAL clause in which the work ordinarily done by *if* is done in its absence by inversion: *Were I Brutus; Had they known in time.*

Interrogative, Imperative, Exclamatory, and Hypothetical Inversions form a group in which inversion itself serves a purpose. With statements it is otherwise: inversion is there performed not for its own significance, but owing to the writer's wish to place at the beginning either the predicate or some word or phrase that belongs to it. He may have various reasons for this. The usual reason for putting the whole of the predicate at the beginning is the feeling that it is too insignificant to be noticed at all after the more conspicuous subject, and that it must be allowed what chance the early position can give it; hence the idiomatic *There is*; not *No God is*, but *There is no God*. That is BALANCE INVERSION in its shortest form, and at greater length it is seen in: *Through a gap came a single level bar of glowing red sunlight peopled with myriads of gnats that gave it a quivering solidity*; if *came through a gap* is experimentally returned to its place at the end of the sentence, it becomes plain why the writer has put it out of its place and at the beginning. Another familiar type is *Among the guests were A, B, C, . . . Z.*

Often, however, the object is not to transfer the predicate bodily to the beginning, but to give first place to some word or words of it. Such a word may be meant to indicate to hearer or reader the connexion with what precedes (LINK INVERSION), to put him early in possession of the theme (SIGNPOST INVERSION), or to warn him that the sentence is to be negative, (NEGATIVE INVERSION): *On this depends the whole course of the argument. By strategy is meant something wider. Never was a decision more abundantly justified. On this, by strategy, never, are the causes of inversion here; each belongs to the predicate, not to the subject; and when such a part of the predicate is placed first it tends to drag with it the verb or auxiliary, so that the subject has to wait; it drags, but with different degrees of force, that exercised by a negative being the strongest. We can if we like, instead of inverting, write On this the whole course of the argument depends, or By strategy something wider is meant, but not Never a decision*

was more abundantly justified; and *Not a word he said* is a very out-of-the-way version of *Not a word did he say*.

If we now add METRICAL INVERSION, our catalogue of the various kinds may perhaps suffice. Where the Bible gives us *As the hart panteth after the water brooks*, and the Prayer Book *Like as the hart desireth the water-brooks*, both without inversion, the hymnbooks have *As pants the hart for cooling streams*. That is *metrigratia*,¹ and it must not be forgotten that inversion is far more appropriate in verse than out of it for two reasons—one this of helping the versifier out of metrical difficulties, and the other that inversion off the beaten track is an archaic and therefore poetic habit. A very large class of bad inversions will be seen presently to be those in subordinate clauses beginning with *as*; they arise from failure to realize that inversion is archaic or poetic under such circumstances, and non-inversion normal; it is therefore worth while to stress this contrast between *As pants the hart* and both the prose versions of the same clause.

To summarize these varieties :

INTERROGATIVE: What went ye out for to see? Doth Job fear God for nought?

IMPERATIVE: Hear thou from heaven thy dwelling-place.

EXCLAMATORY: How dreadful is this place! What a piece of work is a man! O bonnie was the rosy brier! Few and evil have the days of the years of my life been. Bitterly did he rue it.

HYPOTHETICAL: Were I Brutus, and Brutus Antony.

BALANCE: There is no God. Through a gap came [an elaborately described ray]. Among the guests were [long list].

LINK: On this depends the whole argument. Next comes the question of pay.

¹ We cannot deny that Mr. Nahum Tate, or the Rev. Nicholas Brady, or both, may have been led by the exigencies of C. M. to use this inversion; but however it came about, it is a justifiable poetic inversion, because the similitude is between the stag's thirst and the Psalmist's desire, not between stag and psalmist. Therefore the grammar which gives prominence to the idea of panting is rhetorically just. (It happens that *pants* is an unfortunate word and terribly inferior to *panteth*. In Jesperson's accommodative English accidence *hart pants* might well stand for *doe-skin breeches*.) There is no line to be drawn between metrical and poetical inversions. And what Mr. Fowler says about inversion being more appropriate in verse is true: it is also true that unjustifiable inversions of grammar *metrigratia* are not so observable as they would be in prose and are readily tolerated, as also are false accentuations: and it is such deformations of speech that the advocates of 'free verse' are out against. [ED.]

SIGNPOST: By strategy is meant something wider.

NEGATIVE: Never was a decision more abundantly justified.

Not a word did he say.

METRICAL: As pants the hart for cooling streams.

We now proceed to consider with the aid of grouped specimens some of the temptations to ill-advised inversion. It may conciliate any one who suspects that the object of this article is to deprive him altogether of a favourite construction, if we at once admit that, though bad inversion is extremely common, non-inversion also can be bad. It is so rare as to call for little attention, but here are two examples: *But in neither case Mr. Galsworthy tells very much of the intervening years; Least of all it is to their interest to have a new Sick Man of Europe.* In negative sentences there is the choice whether the negative shall be brought to the beginning or not, but when it is so placed inversion of the verb is necessary; read *does Mr. G. tell, and is it.*

INVERSION AFTER RELATIVES AND COMPARATIVES

The problems offered are interesting, but most difficult to grapple with by way of argument. The line here taken is that the sort of inversion now being dealt with, however devoutly one may believe it to be mistaken, can hardly be proved illegitimate, at any rate without discussion of more tedious length than could be tolerated. On the other hand, it is hardly credible, after a look through the collection shortly to follow, that the writers can have chosen these inversions either as the natural way of expressing themselves or as graceful decoration; so unnatural and so ungraceful are many of them. It follows that the motive must have been a severe sense of duty, a resolve to be correct, according to their lights, at any sacrifice. And from this again it follows that no demonstration of incorrectness is called for; the task is only to show why non-inversion should be permitted, and these idolaters will be free of the superstitions that clamp their native taste. The quotations are arranged in batches, with a number attached to that one in each batch which is to be discussed below. The reader will perhaps be kind enough to translate each specimen into the uninverted order and pass a preliminary judgment upon it.

1. A frigate could administer roughly half the punishment that *could a 74.*

With good peripheral railways, such as *have our invaders*, the front can be strengthened.

2. It costs less than *did administration* under the old companies.

Ships without funnels, carrying far more than *can* the steam-driven *vessel*.

3. It is unlikely that a conflict can be localized, as *were* the previous *struggles* in 1908 and 1909.

He looked forward, as *do we all*, with great hope and confidence to Monday's debate.

It represents the business interests of Germany as *does* no other *organization*.

... his fondness for the game, which he played as *should an Aberdonian*.

These were persons to be envied, as *might be some one* who was clearly in possession of a sixth sense.

The French tanks have had their vicissitudes, as *have had ours*.

4. Each has proven ably that the other's kind of Protection would be quite as ruinous as *would be Free Trade*.

We are unable to ... without getting as excited over the question of funds as *is a cat on a hot iron*.

He was as far removed as *are the poles* asunder from the practices which made the other notorious.

The lawn-tennis championships will be attracting as much attention as *has the golf championship*.

Thirteen divisions taken from reserve is now as serious as would have been some fifty *divisions* four months ago.

Judge Parry's interest in ephemeral drama is known, of course, as well as *are his views* on the law of ...

5. Bad as *has been our record* in the treatment of some of the military inventions of the past, it may be doubted whether the neglect of the obvious has ever been more conspicuously displayed than in ...

And, hopeless as *seem* the other *divisions* of Belfast, progress is being made in them.

6. It is not all joy to be a War Lord in these days, and gloomy though *is the precedent*, the only thing left for a War Lord to do is to follow the example of Ahab at Ramoth Gilead.

7. The work stands still until *comes* the convenient time for arranging an amiable rupture of the old engagement and contracting of the new.

Comments on these groups:

i. Compare some everyday sentence: *You earn twice the money that I do*, never *that do I*. The misconception is

perhaps that the putting of the object first (here *that*) should draw the verb ; but this is not true of relative clauses ; *the people that I like, not that like I.*

2. A simple parallel is *I spend less than you do*, for which no one in talk would substitute *than do you*. Many, however, would write, if not say, *I spend less than do nine out of ten people in my position*. The difference must lie in the length of the subject, and the misconception must be that it is a case for balance inversion, i.e. for saving the verb from going unnoticed ; but so little does that matter that if the verb is omitted no harm is done ; *did* in the quotation should in fact be either omitted or put in one of its natural places, after *administration*, or after *companies*.

3. *As*, in such sentences, is a relative adverb ; it and the unexpressed *so* to which it answers are equivalent to (*in the way*) *in which*, and what was said above of relatives and inversion holds here also. *Try to pronounce it as I do, not as do I* ; and when the subject is longer, e.g. *the native Frenchman*, though *as does the native Frenchman* becomes defensible, it does not become better than *as the native Frenchman does*, nor as good.

4. The *as* of this batch differs from that of batch 3 in that its fellow *as* of the main sentence belongs to an adjective (*ruinous, excited, &c.*) or adverb (*far, well*). This allows the inversionist a different defence, which he needs, since balance inversion is clearly not available for *as would be Free Trade* with its short subject. He might appeal here to exclamatory inversion. When the compound sentence is reduced to its elements, they are either (a) *Free Trade would be ruinous ; Protection would be equally ruinous* (the first clause being a statement) : or (b) *Ruinous would Free Trade be ! ; Protection would be equally ruinous* (the first clause being an exclamation). He chooses, how reasonably let the reader judge, the (b) form, and retains its order in the compound sentence. The truth is that in three of these sentences the verb should have been omitted, and in the others kept in its ordinary place—*as the poles are asunder, as the golf championship has attracted, as fifty would have been.*

5. The meaning of this *as* idiom is clear ; it is *Though our record has been so bad, or However bad our record has been* ; but how it reached its present form is less apparent. Some light is thrown by the presence in earlier English of another *as*, now dropped ; Swift writes *The world, as cen-*

sorious as it is, hath been so kind; this points to (*Be our record as*) *bad as our record has been (bad)* for the unabbreviated form. Omission of the bracketed words gives the uninverted order, which will only be changed if exclamatory inversion (*Bad has been our record!*) or balance inversion is needlessly applied.

6. *Gloomy is the precedent!* is a not impossible exclamatory inversion; and, if the words were kept together with the effect of a quotation by having *though* before them instead of in the middle of them, the exclamatory order might be tolerable, though hardly desirable, even in the subordinated form; but not with *though* where it is. This may be tested by trying a familiar phrase like *Bad is the best. Though bad is the best, yes; but not Bad though is the best*; instead of that we must write *Bad though the best is*.

7. There is no doubt about the motive. It is a balance inversion, and one that would be justified by the great length of the subject if the only place for the uninverted *comes* were at the end of the whole sentence. But what is too often forgotten in such cases is that there is usually a choice of places for the verb; here *comes* would be quite comfortable immediately after *time*.

The conclusion suggested is that, so far as relative clauses, and especially those containing *as*, are concerned, the writer whose taste disposes him to use the natural uninverted order is, at the very least, free to indulge it.

INVERSIONS OF THE LITERARY PARAGRAPHIST

The gentlemen who provide newspapers with short accounts of newly published books have an inversion form all to themselves. The principle seems to be that the title of the book is to be got into a place where the reader shall be able to find it, and yet without the catalogue appearance that results if the title is printed at the head before the description; a literary air is to be thus given to the paragraph. The title is therefore worked to the end, by the use of queer inversions that editors would do well to prohibit. But, once broken in to inversion by this special application of it, the minor literary critics learn to love their chains, and it is among them that the false exclamatory inversions dealt with in the next section are most rife. Here, meanwhile, are some of the characteristic forms:

Most easily written, with an easy conversational style about it, is Mr. Frank Rutter's 'The Path to Paris'.

Diplomatic and military are the letters that comprise the Correspondence of Lord Burghersh, edited by his daughter-in-law.

From the point of view of the English reader timely is the appearance of M. Féderic Masson's historical study [title].

Lively and interesting are the pictures of bygone society in town and country presented in the two volumes, 'The Letter-bag of Lady Elizabeth Spencer-Stanhope'.

Mainly concerned with the rural classes, who form something like two-thirds of the whole population, are the sketches and tales collected in 'The Silent India'.

Based on contemporary writers, her own love-letters, and 'anti-Napoleonic pamphleteers', is [title].

Written in his most vivacious vein is Lieut.-Colonel Haggard's latest historical study [title].

FALSE EXCLAMATORY INVERSION

It has already been pointed out that a statement may be turned into an exclamation by inversion; an adjective or adverb that conveys emotion is put first out of its place, and inversion follows. If Jacob had said *The days of the years of my life have been few and evil*, he would have been stating a bald fact; by beginning *Few and evil have*, he converts the statement into a groan, and gives it poignancy. Writers who observe the poignancy sometimes given by such inversion, but fail to observe that 'sometimes' means 'when exclamation is appropriate', adopt inversion as an infallible enlivener; they aim at freshness and attain frigidity. In the following examples there is no emotional need of exclamation, and yet exclamatory inversion is the only class to which they can be assigned:

Futile were the endeavour to trace back to Pheidias' varied originals, as we are tempted to do, many of the later statues.

Finely conceived is this poem, and not less admirable in execution.

Facile and musical, sincere and spontaneous, are these lyrics.

Hard would it be to decide which of his many pursuits in literary study he found most absorbing.

Fluctuating were the conditions under which the portage could be made.

Sufficient is it to terminate the brief introduction to this notice by stating . . .

Irresistibly is the reader reminded, though direct analogy is absent, of Sheridan's reference to . . .

Appropriately does the author prelude his recollections with . . .
 Lately has been launched here the scare of an alleged Russian
 grain-export monopoly.

By diligent search in sunny and sheltered places could some
 short-stalked pimposes be gathered (This is perhaps, however,
 a negative inversion gone wrong by the omission of the necessary
only at the beginning).

Little by little are these poor people being hemmed in and
 ground down by their cruel masters (*little by little* is quite the
 wrong expression to start an exclamatory inversion with, since
 its effect is not to enhance, but to diminish, the emotional effect).

YET, ESPECIALLY, RATHER, ETC.

A curious habit has grown up of allowing these and similar words to dictate a link inversion when the stressing of the link is so little necessary as to give a noticeable formality or pomposity to the passage. It is a matter not for argument, but for taste; will the reader compare the quoted forms with those suggested in the brackets? *Especially* and *rather* usually change their place when inversion is given up, but *yet* remains first. The last example, in which the unusual *in particular* with this construction is felt to be intolerable, is strong evidence that the order to which custom has reconciled us with certain words only is not good in itself.

The set epistolary pieces, one might say, were discharged before the day of Elia; yet *is* there certainly no general diminution of sparkle or interest (yet there is).

His works were burnt by the common hangman; yet *was the multitude* still true to him (yet the multitude was).

Henry Fox, or nobody, could weather the storm which was about to burst; yet *was he* a person to whom the court, even in that extremity, was unwilling to have recourse (yet he was).

. . . springs of mineralized water, famous from Roman times onward for their curative properties; especially *did they* come into renown during the nineteenth century (they came into renown especially).

Mr. Campbell does not recognize a change of opinion, but admits a change of emphasis; especially *is he* anxious at the present time to advance the cause of Liberal Evangelism (he is especially anxious).

It is to be hoped that some supervision will be exercised in the reproductions; especially *will care* be needed in the painting process (care will be needed especially in).

His love of romantic literature was as far as possible from

that of a mind which only feeds on romantic excitements; rather *was it* that of one who was so moulded . . . (it was rather that).

There is nothing to show that the Asclepiads took any prominent share in the work of founding anatomy, physiology, zoology, and botany; rather *do these* seem to have sprung from the early philosophers (these seem rather).

His book is not a biography in the ordinary sense; rather *is it* a series of recollections culled from . . . (it is rather).

An undefeated Prussia is ultimately the end of England and, in particular, *is it* the end of fortune and security for . . . (and it is the end in particular).

INVERSION IN INDIRECT QUESTIONS

Indirect question is the grammarian's name for a modification of what was originally a question, such that it does not stand by itself as a sentence, but is treated as a noun, serving for instance as subject or object to a verb outside of it. Thus: direct question, *Who are you?*; indirect question, *I asked who he was*, or *Tell me who you are*, or *Who you are is quite irrelevant*. The point to notice is that the inversion of direct question normally disappears in the indirect form. Now, how far is it legitimate to substitute in an indirect question the order of words that properly belongs to direct questions? The lamentable craze for inversion among writers who are fain to make up for dullness of matter by verbal contortions is no doubt responsible for the prevailing disregard of normal order. Take these five types:

- A. How old are you?
- B. Tell me how old you are;
or, Tell me how old are you.
- C. He wondered how old she was;
or, He wondered how old was she.
- D. He doesn't know how old I am;
or, He doesn't know how old am I.
- E. How old I am is my affair;
or, How old am I is my affair.

A is the direct question; in B, C, D, and E, the first form contains the normal, and the second the abnormal, indirect question. It will be seen that the abnormal form is progressively disagreeable as we recede from interrogative governing verbs, until in E it might fairly be thought impossible. To contortionists, however, all things are possible; readers possessed of the grammatical sense, or of literary

taste, will find the following examples of the abnormal order repugnant in the same degree as the types to which the letters B, E, &c., assign them ; it is only the encroachments of inversion in general that palliate this special abuse in indirect questions :

I have been asked by the Editor to explain what *are the duties* of the Army towards the civil power, how *is it* constituted, to whom *does it owe* allegiance, by whom *is it paid*, and what *is the source of its authority* (B. The reason why the first and last clauses here are less distasteful than the others is explained later).

It shows inferentially how powerless *is that body* to carry out any scheme of its own (D. Normal order—how powerless that body *is*).

Experience has taught in what a restricted region *can the State as trader or owner act to the general advantage* (D. Normal order—the State *can act to the general advantage as trader*).

How bold *is this attack* may be judged from the fact that . . . (E. Normal order—How bold *this attack is*).

Why *should we be so penalized* must ever remain a mystery (E. Normal order—Why *we should*).

The further remarks promised on the first example are these : three of the five indirect-question clauses in that are clear cases of abnormal order—*how is it* instead of *how it is*, *to whom does it owe* instead of *to whom it owes*, and *by whom is it paid* instead of *by whom it is paid* ; but about the other two, which whether designedly or not act as advance-guard and rearguard covering those between and almost preventing us from discovering their character, it is not so easy to say whether they are abnormal or not. That is a characteristic of the special type of question consisting of subject, noun complement, and the verb *be* ; in the answer to such questions, subject and complement are transposable. Question, *What are the duties?* ; answer, indifferently, *These are the duties*, or *The duties are these* ; to the first form corresponds in the indirect question *Explain what are the duties*, and to the second, *Explain what the duties are* ; and it can therefore hardly be said that one is more normal than the other. But to questions made of other elements than subject + *be* + noun complement, e.g. *How is it constituted?*, the two answers (*It is constituted thus*, and *Thus is it constituted*) are far from indifferent ; one is plainly normal and the other abnormal. This minor point has been discussed only because sentences like *Explain what*

are the duties might be hastily supposed to justify all other uses of direct-question order in indirect-question constructions.

SUBORDINATED INVERSIONS

Certain kinds of these have been discussed in the section on relatives and comparatives. A more general point is to be made here—that it is often well, when a sentence that standing by itself would properly be in the inverted form is subordinated as a clause to another, to cancel the inversion as no longer needed. The special effect that inversion is intended to secure is an emphasis of some sort, and naturally emphasis is more often suited to a simple independent sentence than to a dependent clause. Examples are grouped under A, B, and C, according to the kind of inversion that has been subordinated, and comment on each group follows:

A. Negative inversion—

The amount involved is no less a sum than £300,000 per annum, to not a penny of which *have the drivers* a shadow of claim.

To give to all the scholars that firm grounding upon which alone *can we* hope to build an educated nation.

He laid down four principles on which alone *could America and Austria* go further in exchanging views.

Now that not only *are* public executions long extinct in this country, but the Press not admitted to the majority of private ones, the hangman has lost his vogue.

But it had only been established that on eighteen of those days *did he* vote.

B. Exclamatory inversion—

Suffice it to say that in almost one-half of the rural district areas *is* there an admitted dearth of cottage homes.

Though once, at any rate, *does* that benign mistily golden irony of his weave itself in.

While for the first time, he believed, *did* naval and military history appear as a distinctive feature.

C. Link inversion—

When, three years later, *came the offer* of a nomination, it was doubtless a welcome solution.

Whilst equally necessary *is it* to press forward to that unity of thought without which . . .

A. In the first three it will be admitted that, while *Upon this alone*, &c. (the independent forms), would require the inversion, *upon which alone*, &c. (the subordinate forms), are at least as good, if not better, without it. The fourth example (executions) will on the other hand be upheld by many who have no inordinate liking for inversion; *not only* is so little used except in main sentences, and therefore so associated with inversion, that *not only public executions are long extinct*, though legitimate, has an unfamiliar sound even after *Now that*. The subordinate inversion in the last A example is not quite what it seems, being due to irresolution between an inverted and an uninverted form; the former would be *But only on eighteen of those days had it been established that he voted*; and the latter, *But it had only been established that he voted on eighteen of those days*.

B. The subordination in two of these only makes more conspicuous the badly chosen pegs on which the inversion is hung. *In almost one-half of the rural district areas*, and *once at any rate*, are not good exclamatory material; *Many a time have I seen him!* shows the sort of phrase that will do. Even if main sentences had been used with these beginnings, they should have been put as statements, i.e. without inversion, and still more when they depend on *Though* and *Suffice it to say that*. In the third example *for the first time* is not incapable of beginning an exclamation; it would pass in a sentence, but becomes frigid in a clause.

C. About these there can hardly be a difference of opinion. If the *when* and *whilst* constructions were absent, it would have been very natural to draw *Three years later*, *Equally necessary*, to the beginning to connect the sentences with what preceded, and inversion might or might not result. But with the interposition of *when* and *whilst* they lose their linking effect, and the natural order should be kept—*When the offer came three years later. Whilst it is equally necessary*.

INVERSION IN PARALLEL CLAUSES

As with combinations of a negative and a positive statement into one, so with inverted and uninverted members of a sentence care is requisite.

Not only *is it* so necessarily bounded by that moving veil which ever hides the future, but also *is it* unable to penetrate . . . into . . . the past (*but also is it* is an impossible inversion, brought about by the correct one that precedes)

Not only in equipment but in the personnel of the Air Battalion *are we* suffering from maladministration (*Not only in equipment* requires *are we suffering*; *in the personnel* requires *we are suffering*. To mix the two is slovenly; the right form would be *We are suffering not only in &c*).

Even *were* this *tract* of country level plain and the *roads lent* themselves to the manoeuvre, it would be so perilous to . . . (*were this tract* is inverted; *the roads lent themselves* is not, and yet, since there is no *if*, it absolutely requires it. Begin *Even if this tract were*; for the only ways to invert the second clause are the fantastic and *lent themselves the roads* and the clumsy *and did the roads lend*).

Had we desired twenty-seven amendments, got seven accepted, and *were* in anticipation of favourable decisions in the other twenty cases, we should think . . . (Mend like the previous one. To read *and were we* would disguise the fact that the whole is one hypothetical clause and not several.)

INVERSION IN DIALOGUE MACHINERY

Novelists and others who have to use dialogue as an ingredient in narrative are some of them unduly worried by the machinery problem. Tired of writing down *he said* and *said he* and *she replied* as often as they must, they mistakenly suppose the good old forms to be as tiring to their readers as to themselves, and seek relief in whimsical variations. The fact is that readers want to know what was said, and the frame into which a remark or a speech is fitted is indifferent to them; or rather, the virtue of frames is not that they should be various, but that they should be inconspicuous. It is true that an absolutely unrelieved monotony will itself become conspicuous; but the variety necessary to obviate that should be strictly limited to forms inconspicuous in themselves. Among those that are not inconspicuous, and are therefore bad, are many developments of the blameless and inconspicuous *said he*, especially the substitution of verbs that are only by much stretching qualified for verbs of saying, and again the use of those parts of verbs that include auxiliaries. A few examples will make these points clear; they are not of the more egregious kind, but most of them exhibit a writer trying not to bore his reader, and nothing bores so fatally as an open consciousness that one is in danger of boring:

'Yes', moodily consented John, 'I suppose we must'.

'Oh?' questioned he.

'Nossignore', disavowed Don Ambrogio.

'Oh, what a sigh!' marvelled Annunziata.

'But then', puzzled John, 'what is it that people mean when they talk about death?'

'The sordid sort of existence', augmented John.

'You misunderstand your instructions', murmured rapidly Mr. Travers.

'I couldn't help liking the chap', would shout Lingard when telling the story.

'I won't plot anything extra against Tom', had said Isaac.

'At any rate, then', may rejoin our critic, 'it is clearly useless . . .'

'I am the lover of a Queen', had often sung the steward in his pantry below.

The ordinary 'said he', &c. ('Thou art right, Trim, in both cases,' said my uncle Toby), was described above as blameless and inconspicuous. Its place among inversions is in the 'signpost' class. The reader is to be given the theme (i.e. here, the speech) at the earliest possible moment; the speech, being grammatically the object of 'said', yet placed first, draws 'said' to it, and 'he', or my uncle Toby, has to wait. But only such insignificant verbs as *said*, *replied*, *continued*, will submit to being dragged about like this; verbs that introduce a more complicated notion, or that are weighted with auxiliaries or adverbs (compare 'went on my uncle Toby' with 'continued my uncle Toby'), or that cannot rightly take a speech as object, stand on their dignity and insist on their proper place.

NOTES AND CORRESPONDENCE

IN Tract II, on English Homophones, p. 20, it was stated that the confusion of *five* and *nine* in the telephone is due to the identity of the vowels in the names of these numbers. According to a report of a lecture by Dr. Fleming last January this is not the whole truth. Dr. Fleming explained that the machine could not pronounce certain consonants, and said that Edison had spent a month in trying to make his instrument say *Sugar*; that not only S was missing but there was an 'extraordinary similarity between the sounds of the letters F and N as pronounced by the telephone, which had led to the constant confusion between the word *five* and *nine*'. So it would seem that the imperfect definition of the consonants is accidentally added to the ambiguity caused by the identity of the vowels. The mechanical register may possibly throw light on some phonetic problems.

[R. B.]

TAMBER. Tr. III, pp. 10, 11.

A correspondent writes: 'In your admirable suggestion that *tamber* should be recognized as the English form of *timbre*, the practical adoption of which I am impatiently awaiting, the words *amber* and *clamber* are quoted in support. Surely *camber* is a better example, being from the French *cambre*, *cambrer*, defined in the O. E. D. as "the condition of being slightly arched" as a vault is (cette poutre commence à se cambrer) from *camera* = *chambre*, our *chamber* (another analogy),—which made the semipopular form *cambrer* in French sixteenth century, whence we took our *camber*.'

[beniss. ED.]

AMERICAN OPINION

In his last book *Soliloquies in England* the American philosopher George Santayana writes (p. 88):

'So the English language, if it should become the medium of international intercourse, might by translation or imitation

of the other literatures, or by infiltration into it of foreign words and styles, become a vehicle for all human ideas.'

The following is quoted from *The Literary Review of the New York Evening Post*, May 20.

'The programme of the Society for pure English is new and grateful . . . Not rigidity but the growth of good English is its plan of campaign . . .

'It is the duty of intellectual leaders whether scholars or artists, to make English fit for our needs . . .

'Therefore the Society whose avowed purpose is to increase the usefulness of English words . . . is worthy of commendation; indeed we may hope that the tiresome wrangle over English English versus American English may be sped towards its end by this attempt . . .'

SOCIETY FOR PURE ENGLISH

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FROM JANUARY 1920 TO 31ST MARCH 1922

EXPENDITURE		INCOME	
To Cost of Printing the Society's Publications.	£84 11 9	By Subscriptions as shown by the Bank Pass Book	£136 19 7
Literary Work in connection therewith.		Subscriptions paid through the Clarendon Press	2 1 3
Stamps and Advertising	14 4 0 2 10 8	Sales of the Society's publications by the Clarendon Press	165 4 8
Balance being Surplus of Income over Expenditure	301 6 5 2 19 1		
	£304 5 6		£304 5 6

Note.—No value has been placed upon the large Stock of the Society's Tracts held by the Clarendon Press.

BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31ST MARCH 1922

LIABILITIES		ASSETS	
Mr. Bridges:—	£ 85 10 2	Balance due from Clarendon Press	£ 16 15 7
For payments on behalf of the Society.	2 19 1	Balance at Bank	7 1 13 8
Balance:—Surplus of Assets over Liabilities			
	£388 9 3		£388 9 3

AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE

I have examined the foregoing Account and Balance Sheet with the books and vouchers of the Society and subject to the value of Stock certify these to be correct as shown by the books.

W. M. BAYLISS, F.S.A.
16 Broad Street, Oxford,
5th September, 1922

